

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF THE
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
OCTOBER 1874.

ARTICLE I.
THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

HOLMAN LECTURE FOR 1874.*

By Rev. F. W. CONRAD, D. D., of Philadelphia.

ARTICLE IX. OF BAPTISM.

This Article, according to the German text of the Augsburg Confession, reads thus:

"Respecting Baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that children ought to be baptized, who, through such Baptism, are presented unto God, and become acceptable unto him. Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned, who teach that Infant Baptism is improper."

According to the Latin text of the Confession, it is as follows:

"Of Baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that by Baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by Baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor. They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the Baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without Baptism."

* Ninth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, delivered on Monday evening, June 22d, 1874.

I. ITS NAMES.

Names, when arbitrarily given, have no reference to the constitution of the object designated by them, but when naturally employed, they are designed to express some characteristic of the person or institution to which they are applied. The name Baptism was employed by Jesus Christ and his Apostles in a natural sense. The generic meaning of the Greek word *Baptismos*, which has been introduced into our English version without undergoing a translation, is that of a *washing*, and it is applied to Baptism by the New Testament writers, because it is a "washing of water by the word," even "a washing of regeneration." And in like manner do the Confessors of the Lutheran Church designate Baptism as a sacrament, a Christian ceremony, a holy ordinance, a divine testimony, because each of these terms represents some characteristic found in the constitution of Baptism.

II. ITS INSTITUTION.

Baptism was instituted by Jesus Christ. The words upon which it was founded by him, are recorded by Matthew and Mark as follows: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Matt. 28 : 19; Mark 16 : 15, 16.

Baptism, not having been devised by man, but instituted in accordance with the will of God, must, therefore, be regarded, not as a human device, but as a divine institution.

III. ITS CONSTITUENT PARTS.

As in nature, things are constituted by the combination of elements, so in the Church of Christ, institutions are formed by the appropriation and union of natural and supernatural elements. The natural element introduced into the constitution of Baptism, is water; the supernatural element, the Word of God. "For," as the Larger Catechism declares, "if the word is separated from the water, it is not different from

that used for ordinary purposes, and it may well be styled a common ablution; but when it is connected with the word as God has ordained it, it is a sacrament, and it is called Christian Baptism." And with this agrees the definition of Baptism given in the Smalcald Articles: "Baptism is nothing else than the word of God connected with water, commanded by his institution. * * As Augustine also says: "The word being added to the element, it becomes a sacrament."

The wisdom of God is manifested in nature, by adapting certain elements for combination, and the same wisdom is exhibited by the adaptation of water and the word to form a sacramental union. To the accomplishment of this end, it was necessary that water, which, as a natural element, was unfitted to enter into combination with the word as a supernatural element, should be so changed by its appropriation to a religious end, as to be adapted for a union with the word in the sphere of the supernatural. This adaptation the water receives through its consecration and use in Baptism. In this manner it becomes an efficacious sign, a vehicle of truth, "a visible word," analogous in its nature to the written word. While the water, therefore, as a sign or symbol, reveals the depravity of man, and the necessity of regeneration, the word enforces the command of God, and presents the promise of pardon, grace and salvation.

"For," says Luther in his sermon on Holy Baptism, "in order that Baptism may be and be called a sacrament, it is necessary, first of all, that some external, tangible sign or substance be employed, through which God deals visibly with us, so that we may be assured of his operation. For without some external sign or medium, God will not operate upon us merely by a deeply secret inspiration, or a peculiar divine revelation. But the external work and sign will accomplish nothing at all, if his word is not added, through which the sign becomes mighty, and we perceive what God is accomplishing in us by this sign. But the divine command also must be united to both these, in order that we may become assured of his will and work in this sign and word. And they should be viewed

in immediate connection with each other, and not be severed and separated, since in union with each other, they constitute a correct Baptism."

IV. ITS ADMINISTRATOR.

Baptism, in order that it may answer the end of its institution, must be administered, that is, the words of the institution must be spoken, and the water applied to the person presented for Baptism, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. An administrator becomes, therefore, indispensable, and God has instituted the holy ministry through his Son, Jesus Christ, authorizing them to preach the gospel to every creature, and to baptize all who believed in his name. Although Baptism is a church ordinance, which is to be administered by the Church, and through which members are initiated into the Church, nevertheless, has the authority to administer it not been conferred upon every believer connected with a Christian congregation, but upon the minister duly called and installed as its pastor. As Christ did not baptize personally, but through his Apostles, so does the Church not baptize directly through its members, but representatively through its minister, as its divinely appointed and ordained head.

V. ITS VALIDITY.

The validity of Baptism depends upon its essential characteristics, and not upon its accidental concomitants. To the former belong its constituent parts, water and the word of God, administered by an authorized minister, according to the command of Christ; to the latter belong the character of the administrator, the mode of applying the water, and the state of the mind and heart of the recipient. When thus administered, Baptism is clothed with the name, word, authority and power of God, and is always valid, whether the preacher who administers it be pious or not pious, whether the water be applied to the person by pouring or sprinkling, or the person be applied to the water by immersion; or whether the person receiving it be a child or an adult, a believer or a deceived unbeliever. Baptism ought, therefore,

never to be repeated. The intrinsic nature and power of the word are not destroyed by the character of the preacher, the manner of its presentation, and the non-reception by the hearer, but remains, according to its divine constitution, quick and powerful; and the same is true of Baptism. Accordingly, Luther says in the Larger Catechism: "Baptism does not become wrong on this account (whether the person baptized believes or does not believe) but all depends upon the word and command of God. Now this is, indeed, a nice point; but it is founded upon the assertion, that Baptism is nothing else than water and the word of God intimately united; that is, when the word is connected with the water, then Baptism is right, although the individual be destitute of faith at the time of his Baptism; for my faith does not *make*, but *receive* Baptism. * * Therefore Baptism ever continues valid. * * But no one is permitted to sprinkle us with water again; for, if a person permit himself to be sunk into water a hundred times, it would still be no more than one Baptism; this work, however, continues and the signification is permanent."

VI. ITS MODE.

The mode of Baptism does not belong to its substance, but to its accidents; and hence, Baptism may be performed by either sprinkling, pouring or immersion. There being no difference of opinion between the Confessors and the Romanists, concerning the mode of Baptism, the subject was not introduced into their Confession; and as it was regarded of minor importance, it was referred to only incidentally, in other portions of the Symbolical Books. The following quotations from the Larger Catechism present such incidental allusions to the mode of Baptism:

"Baptism is not our work but God's. For thou must distinguish between the Baptism which God gives, and that which the keeper of a bath-house gives. But God's work to be saving does not exclude faith, but demands it, for without faith it cannot be grasped. For in the mere fact that thou hast had water poured on thee, thou hast not so received

Baptism as to be useful to thee; but it profits thee if thou art baptized with the design of obeying God's command and institution, and in God's name of receiving in the water the salvation promised. This neither the hand nor the body can effect, but the heart must believe." "We should say, I am baptized, therefore the promise of salvation is given me for soul and body."

"For to this end these two things were done in Baptism, that the body, which can only receive the water, is wet by pouring, and that in addition, the word is spoken that the soul may receive it. The act (of Baptism) consists in our being put in connection with the water, and after its passing over us, in being withdrawn from it again. These two, our being put in connection with the water, and being withdrawn from it again, signify the efficacy and work of Baptism, which are nothing else but the mortification of the old Adam, and afterwards the rearing of the new man."

These are the words of Luther. In the first quotation, he refers manifestly to the mode of Baptism by pouring, and in the second no less explicitly to that of immersion. From these declarations, as well as from his translations, liturgies and other writings, it is demonstrable, that he believed sprinkling and pouring to be a valid and scriptural mode of Baptism; that at a certain period of his life, he expressed a preference for immersion, but that he never regarded it as necessary, and that he cannot, therefore, be truthfully claimed as an immersionist. While Baptism was commonly administered in Europe during the sixteenth century by pouring and sprinkling, as well as by immersion, all over Germany it was performed, says Bugenhagen, "by pouring the water over the head and shoulders of the child." And pouring and sprinkling have been adopted as the preferable mode by the Lutheran Church in all ages and lands.

VII. ITS SUBJECTS.

That adult believers are proper subjects of Baptism was taken for granted by the Confessors as the doctrine held by the Church universal; and that it ought also to be adminis-

tered to children, they declare in the article of their Confession under consideration. That children are proper subjects of Baptism is demonstrable from the following arguments, to most of which reference is made in the Symbolical Books.

1. *From the Command of Christ.* The word, as one of the essential elements of Baptism, authorizes the Apostles to baptize "all nations." The command thus issued by Jesus Christ, is not specific, directing ministers of the gospel to baptize men, women or children, but generic, commissioning them to baptize "all nations," and, therefore, it includes children as well as adults. While the command to baptize is unrestricted to either age or sex, it is, nevertheless, limited in its application by the qualifications demanded as conditions of its reception. The qualifications thus required of adults, are repentance and faith; and the requisition for the baptism of children is, that at least one of the parents be a believer in Christ. These conditions are presented in other portions of the sacred Scriptures, and were required by the Apostles in the administration of Baptism, both to adult believers and the children of their households.

2. *From the constitution, unity and perpetuity of the Church.* God, in the original constitution of his Church, established infant membership, and instituted circumcision as the rite through which children were to be admitted into it. At first, membership was mainly confined to the Jews, but, "in the fulness of time," the same privilege was conferred upon the Gentiles. In the accomplishment of this end, God did not organize a new Church, but simply extended the ecclesiastical advantages of the Jewish Church to all the Gentile nations. He did not pluck up the old "olive tree," but simply broke off some of "the natural branches," and then cut off branches from the wild "olive tree," and grafted them "into the good olive tree" in their stead, in order that they might become partakers of "the root and fatness" thereof. Christ, the Chief Shepherd, did not establish a new fold, neither did he confine his pastoral supervision to the sheep of the Jewish fold, but realizing that he had other sheep, which were not of that fold, he made the necessary provision for bringing

them in, in order that there might be and remain, as there had been, "but one fold and one Shepherd." In other words, Christ did not make such radical changes in the New Testament dispensation as to constitute a new Church. He did not restrict church membership to adults, and thereby exclude children from its rights and blessings secured to them by covenant and promise in all generations. Baptism was simply substituted for circumcision, as the initiatory rite of the Church; it became the sign of the same promise and the seal of the same covenant; it was administered to parents and children by the Apostles, as circumcision had been to Jewish fathers and their male children; and, hence, Baptism is expressly declared by the inspired writers, to be "the circumcision made without hands," even "the circumcision of Christ."

"Through Baptism," says the Larger Catechism, "we are first taken into the community of Christians and of the Christian Church. If Infant Baptism were wrong hitherto, down to the present day, there could not have been a Christian on earth. Now, since God confirms Baptism by the communication of his Holy Spirit, as was truly the case in some of the Fathers, as St. Bernard, Gerson, John Huss, and others who were baptized in their infancy; and as the holy Christian Church cannot discontinue until the end of the world, it must indeed be acknowledged, that such Baptism of children is pleasing to God. For God cannot be against himself, or favor falsehood and knavery, or grant his grace and Spirit to this end. * * For this article: I believe in a holy, Christian Church, the communion of saints, can neither be withdrawn from us nor overthrown."

The logical force of this argument may be illustrated by reference to the relation of the common and statute laws of the State. The common law confers general rights and privileges; the statute law repeals and limits them. The plaintiff having established his right to a certain privilege by the common law, his claim cannot be annulled, unless the defendant proves that the right in dispute has been repealed by express provision of the statute law. In like manner, does the

Old Testament establish church membership, and confer its privileges upon children. Now, unless the New Testament, by express provision, repeals the right conferred upon children, and restricts the privilege of church membership to adults, their claim to all its advantages remains in full force. It was entirely unnecessary, therefore, that Christ should institute infant membership and command his Apostles to baptize children. But if it was his design to deprive children of the blessings conferred upon them from the days of Abraham, it was indispensable that he should do this by giving specific directions to that effect, and enforcing them by adequate reasons. But as he gave no such command, his Apostles regarded the claims of children to membership in his Church as valid, and uniformly baptized the heads of families, who became believers, together with their households.

3. *From the unity and perpetuity of the Covenant of Grace, with all its promised blessings.* God originally instituted a covenant with Abraham and his posterity, in the words following, to wit: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee and thy seed after thee." Gen. 17 : 7. Into this covenant, God commanded the children of Israel, in all their tribes and with all their children, to enter, from generation to generation. Deut. 29 : 9. The token of this covenant was circumcision, and the divine direction was given that every man child among them should be circumcised. Gen. 17 : 10. The promises connected with this covenant embraced a numerous posterity, the land of Canaan, the privileges of church membership, the Messiah, and all the blessings of redemption. These blessings were sealed by circumcision, and forfeited by its neglect. "Every man child who is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." Gen. 17 : 14.

From all the references made by the inspired Apostles to the covenant made with Abraham, the following propositions are clearly established: That this covenant was not designed

to be temporary, but "everlasting," and hence, it has not been annulled, but remains in full force. Gal. 3 : 17. That the heathen, the Gentiles, as well as his natural posterity became alike the seed and children of Abraham, of the covenant, and of the promise through faith. That the promise, "In thee and thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," embraced in the covenant, included Christ and the Holy Spirit, the Gospel with all the blessings of grace and redemption. That, as the natural seed of Abraham received the sign of circumcision, as the seal of the righteousness of faith, so did the spiritual seed of Abraham receive the sign of Baptism, as the seal of the same righteousness of faith. Gal. 3 : 27, 29 ; Rom. 4 : 11. That all believers, as Abraham's seed, are "heirs according to the promise," which pertains to them and their children, and to as many as the Lord our God shall call. Gal. 3 : 29 ; Acts 2 : 39. And that, accordingly, both Jews and Gentiles, as soon as they became believers, were called upon to be baptized, together with their children. Acts 2 : 38, 39. Now, as the covenant of grace, in the Jewish dispensation, embraced children ; as the promise connected with it had reference to children ; as circumcision, the token of it, was applied to children ; as the blessings sealed by it were conferred upon children, it follows, that as the covenant, the promise and the blessings remain the same, Baptism, the rite which confirms the covenant and seals its promised blessings in the Christian dispensation, ought to be applied to the same subjects, namely, to parents and children. And as the substitution of Baptism for circumcision did not annul the covenant, nor render its promise of none effect, neither did it confine its blessings to adults and withhold them from children.

The strength of the argument and the weakness of the objection to it, based upon the substitution of Baptism for circumcision, may be illustrated by reference to the amendment of a constitution. Suppose that 'by the old constitution of a state, certain prerogatives should be conferred upon every naturalized adult citizen as well as upon his children—say, the right of voting and holding office upon the adult, and the

right of free education and moral culture upon the children—and that these prerogatives should be confirmed according to a prescribed ceremony. This constitution, as amended, makes no change either in the conditions required, or in the prerogatives conferred by naturalization, but provides for a change in the ceremony of ratification. The substitution of one form of ratification for another, could manifestly in no wise affect the proper subjects of naturalization, nor limit the prerogatives granted thereby. These would remain as secure to the children as to their parents. The Old Testament confers certain ecclesiastical prerogatives upon parents and children, and confirms them by a religious ceremony, circumcision. The New Testament nowhere either restricts or annuls the rights and privileges confirmed to parents and their children by the Old Testament. It simply sets aside circumcision and substitutes Baptism as the more significant and appropriate mode of initiating believers and their households into one holy Church of the living God, and of sealing to them the blessings promised in the covenant of grace and redemption. The substitution of Baptism for circumcision must, therefore, be regarded as simply a ceremonial arrangement, affecting no radical change in the constitution of the Church, the persons entitled to membership, or the prerogatives conferred upon them by covenant and promise.

4. *From the instructions and example of Christ.* "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them. Matt. 19: 13—15. Mark adds, "And he took them up in his arms put his hands upon them and blessed them." "And he took a child and set him in the midst of them, and when he had taken him in his arms he said unto them, whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me, and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." Mark 9: 36, 37. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein."

Luke 18 : 17. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." "And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said: Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, it were better for him, that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you that in heaven, their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven. For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost. Even so, it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." Matt. 18 : 2—5, 6, 10, 11, 14.

In these passages, the opinions and instructions of Christ concerning little children are given, and the manner in which he treated them, and desired that his disciples should treat them, are set forth. He regarded them as among the lost, whom he came, according to the will of his Father, to save from perishing. He warns all against despising them, threatens those who offend them, rebuked those who forbade them to come to him, and declared that angels appeared as their representatives in the presence of God in heaven. He received them, took them in his arms, laid his hands on them, and imparted his blessing to them. Created by him, and redeemed by his blood, he claimed them as his own, opened the door of his kingdom and invited them to come in, directed parents to bring them to him, and instructed his Apostles to receive them in his name. As an incentive to obedience, he announced that those who received such little ones which believe on him, in his name, that is, because they belong to him, do thereby receive both him and the Father that sent him. And as a consequence of these truths, he positively affirms, that unless men be converted and become as little children, and thus receive Christ and the kingdom of heaven, they shall in no wise enter therein, because of such is the kingdom of heaven. It is hardly necessary to add, that

through Infant Baptism the views and directions of Christ in regard to little children are carried out, and his example and that of his Apostles in their treatment of them, imitated; while the sentiments and practice of those who reject Infant Baptism appear in striking contrast therewith.

5. *From the practice of household Baptism by the Apostles.* Baptism was not first instituted by John the Baptist, and afterwards adopted by Christ, as the initiatory rite of his Church, but it originated among the Jews, and was practised by them ages before in the reception of proselytes from among the heathen. Maimonides testifies that Baptism was already practised in the wilderness before the giving of the law; that proselytes were thus made to Judaism in the days of Solomon and David; and that the children of the proselytes were baptized as well as their parents. And Lightfoot, the greatest of the old rabbinical scholars, says: "The baptizing of infants was a thing as commonly known and as commonly used before John's coming, and at the time of his coming and subsequently, as any thing holy that was used among the Jews; and they were as familiarly acquainted with Infant Baptism as they were with Infant Circumcision."

Under such circumstances, it is manifest that the Apostles, being Jews, with their knowledge of the establishment of infant membership in the Church, and the practice of infant Baptism prevalent among them before their eyes, would continue the reception of children into the Church by Baptism, unless they were prohibited from doing so in so many words by Christ himself. And as no such prohibition was given by him, they continued the practice of baptizing the children of all parents who professed faith in Jesus Christ. Accordingly it is expressly mentioned by Luke, that Lydia, as soon as her heart was opened, so that she attended to the things which were spoken by Paul, "was baptized and her household;" and that when the jailor at Philippi believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, "he and all his were baptized straightway;" and Paul states that he "baptized also the household of Stephanus." In this manner, believing parents and their children became ecclesiastical households, or Christian churches.

There was such a Church organized in the house of Philemon, (Phil. 1: 2); in the house of Nymphas, (Col. 4: 15); and in the house of Aquilla and Priscilla, (Rom. 16: 25). These churches were designated by the name of the father of the family and called his "house." The "house of Stephanus" and the "house of Onesiphorus" were constituted ecclesiastical households or Christian Churches through Infant Baptism, as practised by the Apostles. In other words, the Apostles practised household Baptism in the organization and government of Christian congregations, both among the Jews and the Gentiles.

6. *From the history of Infant Baptism in the Christian Church.* Infant Baptism must either be a human invention, or a divine institution. If it be a human invention, it must have had an inventor; it must have been introduced at a certain period by some one, and history must have recorded his name, the time when the innovation was introduced, and the process through which his sentiments and practice became universal in the primitive church. But the pages of ecclesiastical history contain no account of its introduction. No such name can be found, no such period is mentioned, and no such ecclesiastical change even referred to by any ecclesiastical writer of the primitive ages of Christianity.

But if Infant Baptism be a divine institution, ordained by Jesus Christ and practised by his Apostles, it would be rational to conclude that its introduction and practice would become general in the primitive Christian churches, and that it would continue to prevail in subsequent ages. And this conclusion is verified by the concurrent testimony of history.

The Christian Fathers represent Infant Baptism as a universal custom, derived from the Apostles. Justin Martyr, born about the time of St. John's death, says: that among the members of the church in his day, "there were many of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ *in their infancy*." Origen, born eighty-five years later, says: "There was a tradition in the Church received from the Apostles, that children also ought to be baptized." Augustine says: "The whole Church prac-

tices Infant Baptism; it was not instituted by councils, but was always in use, and that he never heard of any person, either in the Church or among the heretics, who denied the propriety of baptizing infants." And this testimony, Pelagius, who travelled in England, France, Italy, Africa and Palestine, corroborates. Infant Baptism can thus be traced from the fifth century down to the first, yea, to the very threshold of the Apostolic Church. The testimony of ecclesiastical history, relative to Infant Baptism, is summed up by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, as follows:

* "During the first four hundred years from the formation of the Christian Church, neither any society of men nor any individual denied the lawfulness of baptizing infants. Tertullian only urged some delay in the baptism of infants, and that not in all cases. And Gregory deferred it perhaps to his own children. In the next seven hundred years, there was neither a society nor an individual, who even pleaded its delay. In the year, A. D. 1120, one sect opposed Infant Baptism, but it was opposed by the other churches as heretical, and soon came to nothing. From that time, no one opposed the Baptism of infants until the year 1522, when the Anabaptists arose, since which period, also, the great body of the Christian Church has continued to practice Infant Baptism."

VIII. ITS SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER, AS A MEANS OF GRACE.

The Confessors declare that "through Baptism the grace of God is offered." By the grace of God they mean those moral and spiritual influences which God, out of pure favor, has introduced into our world, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, under whose operation man is induced to exercise faith in the word and promise of God, through which he obtains the remission of sins, becomes a new creature, and is recognized as an heir of eternal life. These gracious influences are exerted by the Holy Spirit, through the word of God. And as we have seen that water, as a constituent element of Baptism, by its appropriation to a sacramental pur-

* Pop. Theol. p. 262.

pose, becomes an efficacious sign, and as a "visible word" united with the written and spoken word, with which the Holy Spirit is united, and through which he operates, Baptism becomes a means of grace coördinate with the word of God. As grace is offered through the promise of the gospel made in Baptism, and when this promise is received by faith, the grace offered is also conferred in Baptism, and becomes efficacious in the justification, regeneration and salvation of the soul. And as children are to be baptized, grace is offered to them, as well as to adults, by Baptism.

In accordance with these views the Apology says: "For it is altogether certain that the divine promises of grace and of the Holy Spirit, belong not only to adults, but also to children. Now, the promises do not apply to those that are out of the Church of Christ, where there is no gospel nor sacrament. For the Kingdom of Christ exists only where the word of God and the sacraments are found. It is, therefore, a truly Christian and necessary practice to baptize children, in order that they may become participants of the gospel, the promise of salvation and grace, as Christ commands, Matt. 28 : 19. Now, as grace and salvation in Christ are offered to all, so Baptism is offered, both to men and women, to youths and infants. Hence, it certainly follows that we may and should baptize infants; for in and with Baptism, universal grace and the treasure of the gospel are offered to them."

Baptism, as a means of grace, is called a sacrament. This word is not found in the Scriptures. It was applied in ancient times to the oath of the Roman soldier (*sacramentum*) by which he bound himself to obedience and loyalty. And as by the sacraments, and especially by Baptism, the Christian is enrolled as a soldier of Christ, and binds himself to be faithful to him, as the Captain of his salvation, it was significantly called by the Latins a sacrament, and is thus designated until this day by the theologians of the Lutheran Church.

Baptism is declared to be one of the "sacraments through which, as means, God imparts the Holy Spirit, who, in his own time and place works faith in those that hear the gos-

pel."* "Concerning their use it is taught, that the sacraments have been instituted, not only as tokens by which Christians may be known externally, but as signs and evidences of the divine will towards us, for the purpose of exciting and strengthening our faith; hence they also require faith, and they are properly used then only, when received in faith and when faith is strengthened by them."† "True sacraments,

* * * commanded of God, have the promise of grace, which in reality belongs to and is the New Testament. For the external signs were instituted to move our hearts, namely, both by the word and the external signs, to believe when we are baptized, and when we receive the Lord's body, that God will be truly merciful to us, as Paul says: Rom. 10 : 17: "Faith cometh by hearing." As the word enters our ears, so the external signs are placed before our eyes, inwardly to excite and move the heart to faith. The word and the external signs work the same thing in our hearts; as Augustine well says: "The sacrament is a visible word; for the external sign is like a picture, and signifies the same thing preached by the word; both, therefore, effect the same thing."‡

Baptism, as a sacrament, according to the above statements, and such as are contained in the parallel passages of the other symbols, is an external religious ceremony, not only a token of recognition through which Christians may be known to each other, but an outward, efficacious sign of the divine will toward us, of the grace of the New Testament, of the covenant of promise, of reconciliation with God, of human depravity, and of the remission of sins. It is a sure testimony, furnishing evidence of God's grace and purpose towards us; a confirmation of the word and a seal of the promise of God. It is a means through which God imparts the Holy Spirit, and operates in exciting and strengthening faith, and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Ghost.

The manner in which Baptism, as a means of grace, exerts its influence and attains its end is also explained. As it is

* A. C. Art. V.

† A. C. Art. XIII.

‡ Apol. Art. VII.

an outward ceremony, a token of recognition and a sign of the most momentous truths, the meaning of the ceremony, the import of the token, and the signification of the sign must be apprehended by the recipient. As it constitutes a peculiar form of evidence concerning the divine will, a sure testimony of God's grace, a confirmation of his word, and a seal of his promise, the strong assurances of truth thus exhibited must be received by faith. And as living faith is the spiritual grace which can apprehend the truth conveyed by a symbol, and rely upon the evidence attested by a seal, it is properly demanded as the necessary condition and qualification for the reception of Baptism and its benefits.

Baptism exhibits and confirms truth in two ways, by sign and by statement, and addresses it to different organs. The eye is the organ through which the truth signified is received, the ear that through which the truth pronounced is received, the latter being the same mode which characterizes the proclamation and reception of the truth when preached. But the internal organ and mode of the reception of the truth, whether symbolized or pronounced in the administration of the sacrament, or preached by the ambassador of Christ, is the same, viz. faith apprehending and confiding in the truth made known by each, according to its respective mode of operation. This is the Lutheran view of the sacraments. The generic conception which runs through them is truth; the informing idea which binds all their elements together, is that of grace; the Spirit which pervades and imparts to them their inherent force, is the Holy Ghost, and the spiritual capacity which distinguishes and appropriates to itself all their contents, is faith.

This view of Baptism, as a means of grace, according to which it exerts its influence through the supernatural power of the truth signified and declared by it, stands in contrast with several erroneous views concerning its efficacy, set forth and rejected by the Confessors. The first is that of Thomas and the Dominicans. They maintained that God had placed a spiritual, supernatural power in the water, and that in consequence thereof, the sins of the recipient were washed away

by the water, in an incomprehensible manner, and without regard to any other part connected with the administration of Baptism.

The second error rejected is that of Scotus and the Franciscans. They maintained that Baptism washes away sins, through the assistance of the divine will, through which such washing alone comes to pass, and not at all through the word and water.

The third error rejected is that of the Romanists. They held that Baptism, as a sacrament, produces justification in its recipients, *ex opere operato*, that is, by the mere outward performance of the work, without faith, without Christ, and without any regard to the disposition of the mind, or any good emotion in the heart. The Scholastics explain it by the manner in which medicine acts upon the body. The force and blessed effects of Baptism lay locked up in the administration itself, like medicine in a box, and upon the bare application of which, all its legitimate effects follow, as when a healing plaster is laid upon a wound.

The Council of Trent teaches, that the sacraments produce their effect, *ex opere operato*, that the grace of God was bound internally and necessarily to them, so that it is not received *through* them but *in* them. Their efficacy or working is therefore, always objectively and necessarily bound to them, wherever and whenever the administration of them is properly celebrated. Their effect does not take place sometimes and upon some persons, but always and upon all persons to whom they are administered. Their efficacy grows out of the matter and form of the sacramental transaction itself; it is specifically its own, and works necessarily through the mere observance thereof. Their benefits depend upon the act itself, its proper administration and reception, and not upon the state of the mind, disposition or spirit of the recipient. Baptism, as a sacrament, impresses once, and for all time, an indelible character upon the soul. The manner in which Baptism operates and produces the justification, regeneration, and salvation of its subjects, may be characterized as objective and arbitrary, physical and materialistic, magical and

mechanical, mysterious and incomprehensible, necessary and irresistible. And while it thus deposits its saving contents into the soul of its recipient, it becomes efficacious, independent of his having either a spiritual apprehension of its symbolic meaning, or true faith in its word of promise. In other words, it exerts its saving power, *ex opere operato*.

ITS EFFECTS.

The effects or benefits of Baptism, in so far as adults are concerned, are not specifically stated by the Confessors in the IX. Article of the Confession, but they are described with a considerable degree of precision and comprehensiveness in other portions of their symbolical writings. In answer to the question: "What are the gifts or benefits of Baptism?" the Small Catechism says: "It worketh the forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation upon all who believe as the word and promise of God declare." In the edition of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Confessors declared that "Original sin is truly sin, which brings all those under the eternal wrath of God, who are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit." In the German edition of 1533, Melancthon modified the concluding phrase as follows: "who are not regenerated by Baptism and faith in Christ, through the gospel and the Holy Spirit." In the Apology he quotes Luther as teaching, "that Holy Baptism extirpates and removes the entire guilt and hereditary debt (*Erbpflicht*) of original sin, although the material (as they call it) of the sin, viz. the evil propensity and lust, remain." In the same sense Augustine is also quoted as saying; "Original sin is forgiven in Baptism, not that it becomes extinct, but it is not imputed."

In reply to the question: "How can water produce such great effects?" The Small Catechism says: "It is not the water, indeed, that produces these effects, but the word of God, which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith, which relies on the word of God connected with the water. For the water, without the word of God, is simply water and no Baptism. But when connected with

the word of God, it is a Baptism, that is, a gracious water of life, and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Ghost, as St. Paul says to Titus 3 : 5—8.

Melanchthon quotes Luther in the Apology as maintaining, "that the Holy Ghost, given through Baptism, begins daily to mortify and blot out the remaining evil desires in us, and puts into the heart a new light, a new mind and spirit. And further: "that original sin as it remains after Baptism is, in itself, not indifferent, but that we need Christ, the Mediator, in order that God may not impute it unto us, and the constant light and operation of the Holy Spirit, to mortify and remove it." And in corroboration of these opinions of Luther, the Apology cites the following passage from Augustine: "The law which is in our members is put away by spiritual regeneration, and yet remains in the flesh which is mortal. It is put away, for the guilt is entirely remitted through the sacrament (Baptism) by which the believers are born anew; and yet it remains, for it produces evil desires against which the believers strives."

Baptism, as thus set forth, was regarded by the Confessors as a means of washing away original, and of sealing the pardon of actual sin, as well as a means of imparting the Holy Spirit, through whose agency the soul is born anew and sanctified by faith in the truth as it is in Jesus. The explanation given of the manner in which Baptism confers these benefits accords with the mode in which the sacraments, as means of grace, produce their saving effects as already described.

The Scriptural doctrine of regeneration is set forth in the following passages: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3 : 3. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." James 1 : 18. "In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the gospel." 1 Cor. 4 : 15. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3 : 5. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." Gal. 3 : 26. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John 5 : 1. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them

that believe upon his name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1 : 12, 13. These passages, with their parallels, declare the absolute necessity of regeneration to salvation. They teach, that the gospel as the word of truth is the instrument, the ambassador of Christ the medium of communication, the Holy Spirit the divine agent, and faith the spiritual exercise of mind in connection with which it ordinarily takes place. The doctrine of regeneration thus taught, the Confessors set forth clearly and unequivocally in the Symbolical Books. They declare in the Apology, that "the natural man is and remains an enemy of God, until by the power of the Holy Ghost, through the word preached and heard, he is converted, endowed with faith, regenerated and renewed." This faith is not a natural faculty, capable of obtaining a "mere historic knowledge of Christ," but a spiritual grace, wrought by the Holy Spirit, which comprehends the word and promise of Christ," awakens the "conviction" of their truthfulness, "receives" and "firmly cleaves" to them, and "trusts in Christ, who was given to atone for the sins of the world, as the only Mediator and Redeemer." And where this faith exists, "we are regenerated by it, and through it we receive the Holy Ghost into our hearts, who renews them, and thus enables us to keep the law of God, to fear and love him." "He who thus believes, rightly apprehends the great, beneficent work of Christ, becomes a new creature, and prior to the existence of such faith in the heart, no one can fulfil the law."

Baptism, as a sacrament, was held by the Confessors to be a means through which, as well as the word, God imparts the Holy Spirit, who in his own time and place works faith in them that apprehend its true significance, and believe the promise of God connected with it. Baptism is consequently not a new species of instrumentality, producing its effects in an arbitrary manner, but it is a means belonging to the same species of the word, through which the Holy Spirit excites, confirms and strengthens faith, in the same manner as he does through the word. The analogy between the manner in

which the word and the sacraments as external signs produce their effects, explained by Melancthon in the *Apology*, is also set forth by Luther. In his *Larger Catechism*, he teaches that Baptism signifies the "mortification of the old Adam, and afterwards the rearing up of the new man. For in this Baptism the Holy Spirit, grace and virtue are given to suppress the old man, that the new man may come forth and increase in strength." But in order that "the gifts and benefits" of Baptism may be received, it is necessary that the import of "the application of the water" should be "apprehended," and the pronouncement of the words of promise comprehended and "believed" with all the "heart." In this manner the soul enters through faith at Baptism upon "the new life," and through "repentance demonstrates and practices it."

In order that the full significance of Baptism may be comprehended, it must be contemplated as a whole. As instituted by Christ, it is a religious ordinance. Its elements are water and the word, its administrator the minister of God, its agent the Holy Spirit. As thus constituted it is revealed to man with the conditions, upon the fulfilment of which, he may secure all its benefits. These conditions are all met by faith. It comprehends its meaning as a "visible word," it relies upon its promise of pardon, it submits to its administration, and it pledges obedience to its authoritative commands. In being baptized, the Christian, on his part, makes a profession of his faith, enters into covenant with God, confesses the name of Christ before men, unites with his Church, and consecrates himself to his service—and God, on his part, places the seal of his covenant upon him, assures him of the remission of his sins, and grants him the gift of the Holy Ghost, that he may be strengthened with might in the inner man, "and kept through faith by the power of God unto salvation." As Baptism comprehends the truth of God, the Spirit of God, and the faith of God, whatever may be predicated of the word, as the means of the Spirit, in working faith and in securing its justifying, regenerating, sanctifying and saving effects, may also be predicated of Baptism. Accordingly, the Scriptures declare that the Word is "the

incorruptible seed" of regeneration, and Baptism "the washing of regeneration;" that man must be "born again by the word," and "born of water," that is of Baptism; that the Church is "sanctified by the word" and cleansed by Baptism, as a "washing of water;" and that the redeemed are saved by the word, and saved by Baptism, through faith in the word and faith in Baptism.

"What God hath, therefore, joined together" in Baptism, "let no man put asunder" by rational speculation. Through an analytical process, its constituent parts may be separated and contemplated in isolation. The water may be separated from the word, the word may be separated from the Spirit, the administrator may be uninvested with authority, and the subject may be destitute of faith. By divesting the water of its significance, the word of its supernatural power, the administrator of authority, and the recipient of faith, Baptism is destroyed, and a human ceremony substituted in its stead and called by its name. And when this process of disintegration has been completed, the theological vandal can with impunity ask: How can a handful of water applied to the head, and a few words addressed by the minister to the ear, wash away sin, renew the heart and save the soul? But as the Scriptures reveal no such Baptism, and contain no affirmations concerning the efficacy of such a ceremony, the question becomes absurd, and needs no answer.

Nor must the efficacy of Baptism be limited to time. It must, of necessity, be administered, but its benefits are by no means confined to the time of its administration. Baptism was the means of imparting the extraordinary influences of the Holy Ghost; but they were not given in the moment of its reception. The disciples of John, whom Paul met at Ephesus, were baptized, but received the Holy Spirit immediately afterwards through the laying on of hands. While Peter was speaking at the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell on his hearers, and he commanded them subsequently to be baptized. Christ received the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove after his baptism in Jordan, and the Apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, in the form of

cloven tongues of fire, without the application of water. Baptism was also the means of imparting the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit. Peter said to the inquirers at Pentecost: "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." These influences of the Spirit were, however, frequently imparted through the word received by faith, and not during the time of the administration of Baptism. The eleven Apostles, of whose Baptism no record was made in the New Testament, received the ordinary gift of the Holy Spirit through faith in the word and call of Jesus. And the same may be affirmed of the great majority of the adult members of the churches organized by the Apostles. Baptism is also the means of conferring the remission of sins. Peter preached a baptism "for the remission of sins," and Paul was commanded by Ananias to "arise, be baptized and wash away his sins," thus receiving, as an adult, the "seal of the righteousness of faith" in Baptism, which, as a child, he had received in circumcision.

But its sealing power was not limited to the period of its reception. That remained in full force and could be appropriated by repentance through subsequent life. There is consequently nothing of a temporary character connected with Baptism. It is not a religious ceremony producing a magical effect during the time of its performance, but it is a divine ordinance, constituted with imperishable elements, and clothed with perpetual efficacy. In accordance with these views, Luther says, "The same words of God once pronounced in the first Baptism endure forever, so that they can afterwards rely on these words if they desire, and the water is poured over them, to enable them also afterwards to comprehend it in faith if they wish." He regarded Baptism not as something isolated and transient, notwithstanding the fact that the external administration soon takes place, but as a permanent and enduring transaction, exerting its influence upon the individual believer from the beginning to the end

of his life, and upon the Church, as the general assembly of the saints, unto the end of the world.

The effects or benefits which Baptism confers upon children, are briefly stated by the Confessors. In the Latin edition, they say that children, being offered to God by Baptism, are received into God's favor." In the German edition they affirm, that children, by "Baptism, are presented to God, and become acceptable to him." This language is generic, and no clear and unmistakable explanation of its precise meaning is given in other parts of the Symbolical Books. This resulted doubtless from the fact, that the inspired writers no where explain the specific effects which take place in the mind and heart of the infant at its Baptism, nor describe in detail the benefits conferred upon them thereby. These effects must therefore be determined rather from analogy, implication and the necessity of the case, than from didactic statements contained in the Scriptures. On this account the subject is involved in more or less obscurity, and beset with grave difficulties. This the Confessors felt and consequently did not attempt to make a specific and full deliverance on the subject, but satisfied themselves with the general statement quoted above.

The difficulties connected with the determination of the effects of Infant Baptism, and the manner in which they are produced, were vehemently urged by the Anabaptists and constantly felt by Luther. He had rejected the *opus operatum* theory of the Romanists and adopted the evangelical theory of the efficacy of the sacraments, according to which the benefits of Baptism can only be received through faith apprehending the truth signified, by the application of the element, confiding in the promise of God repeated in its administration, and obeying the command of God enjoined in the words of its institution. His efforts were accordingly directed to the origination of hypotheses by the aid of which he attempted to explain the effects of Baptism, and the manner in which they are produced in infants, as consistent with the manner in which the same effects are produced in adults, viz.

by faith. He at first maintained that children believe in a technical sense, but subsequently admitted that they have not baptismal faith in the evangelical sense, and helped them out by substituting the faith of the Church, which presents them for Baptism. He also held that through the power of the prayers of the believing Church, God infuses faith into the child, and attributes the production of the same effect to the operation of the Holy Spirit through the word of God spoken in the baptismal act. These hypotheses, however, neither silenced the Anabaptists nor satisfied Luther. He was accordingly led in the year 1528, to make a thorough re-investigation of the whole subject in the light of the Holy Scriptures, the result of which was a modification of his views and the full development of his doctrine of Infant Baptism.

Baptism is an ordinance of God. Its validity depends not upon the faith or worthiness of the recipient, but upon its divine institution. Its *essence* consists of the element and word, through which its *power* is exerted by the Holy Ghost. As thus constituted, it is clothed with objective force, which faith may sooner or later appropriate. Its *validity* stands fast whether faith be present or not, but its *beneficial effects* can only be fully realized by faith. He still holds that children have faith, and that the contrary cannot be proved, but he hands the discussion of the question over to the doctors. In 1523 he had said to the Bohemian Waldensians, "It would be better to baptize no child any where, than to baptize without faith;" but in 1528 in writing on Anabaptism he said: "Faith indeed is not for the promotion of Baptism, but Baptism for the promotion of faith. Now, when faith comes Baptism has what it requires, and rebaptism is useless." And he predicated the Baptism of children not upon their hypothecated faith, but upon the command of God who calls them to himself and authorizes them to be baptized. Baptism is a prevenient movement of God towards the child, through which he makes a presentation of grace and adopts it into his family. Universal grace revealed in the gospel specializes and individualizes itself in Baptism, so that personal faith,

whenever it may be exercised, does not arise from the natural ability of man, but is called forth through the prevenient grace of God, which is objectively presented and revealed in the sacrament. He holds that the effects of Baptism commence in the child with its administration, according to the degree of lively susceptibility possessed by it, without determining, however, how far this extends. This susceptibility he calls faith, and regards it as constituting the new birth. "The spiritual birth," says he in his sermon on Baptism, "takes its rise, indeed, in Baptism, proceeds and increases; but only in the last day is its significance fulfilled; only in death are we rightly lifted out of Baptism by the angels into eternal life."

In the study of nature, the truth of a theory can only be demonstrated by proving that all the facts pertaining to the subject are consistent with and can be readily interpreted by it. And the same method is required to establish the truth of a theory in theology. The theory of Infant Baptism must, therefore, be consistent with and interpret all that is declared in the Scriptures concerning the state, capacities, and relations of children. This Luther felt and made the attempt to accomplish. Having adopted the theory that the exercise of evangelical faith was indispensable to the reception of the benefits of Baptism in an adult, he at first maintained that children became partakers of its blessings in the same way, that is by faith. He accordingly adopted the hypothesis that children have faith. In the Larger Catechism he says: "With respect to Infant Baptism, we bring forward the child under the impression and the hope that it believes." If this means that children in their natural state have faith, it contradicts the declaration made in the II. Article of the Confession on Original Sin, "that all men who are naturally engendered are conceived and born in sin; that they are all, from their mother's womb, full of evil desires and propensities, and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God."

Luther also adopted the hypothesis that faith is infused into children through the faith and prayers of the Church.

"The young children" says he, "are through the faith and prayer of the Church, purified from unbelief and the devil, and gifted with faith, and accordingly baptized." But this method of infusing a faith that purifies and renews the child, differs from that in which faith is said to be wrought by the Holy Spirit through the preached word in the V. Article of the Augsburg Confession, and accords much more nearly with the spiritualistic conception of the Anabaptists, that the Spirit operates directly and independently of the word. Luther also adopted the hypothesis that faith was imparted to the child in Baptism, through the words uttered at its administration. The sound of the word of God spoken strikes outwardly upon the ear of the child, through which the Holy Spirit, who is almighty, and to whom nothing is deaf, imparts to it faith, that is, a greater susceptibility for the word of God. But as the child cannot comprehend the meaning of the sound of the words spoken, the effect attributed to them must be produced mechanically, and savors more of the magical operation of the Romish *opus operatum* than the method of the Scriptures, according to which faith cometh by a hearing, which apprehends the meaning of the word heard.

Luther uses the word faith as applied to children in a technical sense. In the Wittenberg Concordia he describes it as follows: "It must not be thought that the children have understood (the word), but there are the movements and inclinations to believe the Lord Christ and to love God, in some measure similar to the movements of those who otherwise have faith and love; and it is in this way that we desire to be understood, when we say that the children have personal faith." He distinguishes between faith as a condition or state of natural susceptibility for God, his word and Spirit, and faith as an act or exercise intelligently and consciously appropriating the grace offered through the word and the sacrament, and explains it as a latent power of reception which is set into activity by Baptism, analogous to the faith of adults in sleep.

These various shades of thought presented by the different forms of expression employed, indicate the impossibility of

originating a satisfactory explanation of the subject. Of a "latent power of reception" in contradistinction from the rational powers with which God has endowed every child, and through the possession of which it becomes a cultivatable being, we can form no distinct conception. And as a change in the susceptibility is conditioned, according to the rational constitution of man, upon a change in the radical disposition in which it inheres; and as a change in the radical disposition can only take place through an intelligent movement or disposing of the mind, the awakening of a spiritual susceptibility for God, his word and Spirit cannot take place, without self conscious and intelligent action; and as infants are incapable of such voluntary action, it is impossible to understand how a spiritual susceptibility in which "inclinations to believe Christ and to love God" arise, can be produced in their hearts through Baptism. All this Luther himself felt and acknowledged. While he still held, that it was reasonable to maintain that children do believe, he admits in his letter on Anabaptism, that it is "unknown to us how they believe, or how faith is wrought in them;" and then adds, "and yet after all, this is of little importance."

The following paragraph taken from the same letter presents the scriptural arguments by which Luther attempted to prove that children can believe. "But we have Scripture to establish the fact, that children may and can believe, even if they have neither language nor cultivated reason. As the Scripture says, the Jews "sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils and shed innocent blood." Ps. 106 : 37, 38. If it were innocent blood, as the text says, they were certainly pure and holy children, and such children they could not be without the Spirit and faith. Again, the innocent children, Matt. 2 : 16, were not over two years old, and undoubtedly destitute of language or cultivated reason; yet they are now holy and happy. And Christ, Matt. 19 : 14, says in reference to little children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." And St. John in his mother's womb was a child, Lk. 1 : 41, and I am of opinion indeed that he could believe."

The argument is not direct but inferential. It is not ex-

pressly stated that any of the children referred to believed. As none of them were baptized, faith could not have been infused into them through Baptism. And if these passages prove that children in their natural state are "innocent," "pure and holy," filled with the Holy Spirit, and morally fit for the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven, and from which it must be inferred that they have faith, then we cannot see how such an interpretation of the above passages can be harmonized with those passages which declare that children are conceived in sin, shapen in iniquity, receive not the things of the Spirit of God, and are by nature children of wrath. Nor can we reconcile such an interpretation with the representations made in the Apology, concerning the natural state of man. "We descendants of Adam are all so born as not to know God, that we despise him and do not trust in him. Yea, that we flee from and hate him. We are born destitute of "original righteousness," that is with an "innate want of divine light and of every thing good, which continues so long as we are not born anew of the Holy Ghost and enlightened by him."

The Confessors regarded the world as fallen, corrupt, lying in wickedness, and doomed to destruction; and redemption as a great remedial movement designed to secure the pardon, moral recovery and salvation of all men. As children were involved in the disabilities entailed by the fall of Adam, they are also included "in the promised redemption of Christ." As original sin exposes them to condemnation and the development of their depravity, provision must be made for their pardon and sanctification, both of which are accomplished, through the atonement of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. As all men are depraved and sinful, "Christ tasted death for every man;" and the Spirit has been poured out "upon all flesh." As there was nothing good in man to induce God to originate the movements of grace towards him, so can there be nothing in man to limit their application, save voluntary unbelief and its concomitants and developments. As there is no voluntary unbelief or actual antagonism to God found in children, no moral barrier exists to prevent the

grace of God from reaching and saving them. As the Scriptures reveal but "one Baptism for the remission of sins" and the bestowment of "the gift of the Holy Ghost," and as children are to be baptized with that Baptism, it must be the means of washing away their original sin and of imparting to them the Holy Spirit. In consistency with these views, the Confessors affirm in the Apology, that children are entitled "to the divine promises of grace (pardon) and of the Holy Spirit," that "in and with Baptism, universal grace and the treasures of the gospel are offered to them;" and that they are to be baptized "in order that they may become participants of the gospel and the promise of grace and salvation." This explains what they meant, when they said in the article under consideration, that through "Baptism the grace of God is offered," and that children, by being presented to God in Baptism, become "acceptable to him and are received into his favor." In other words, they held that through Baptism children were "born of water and of the Spirit," yea, "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," who would, in his own time, place and manner, develop faith, as well as work in them "both to will and to do, of his good pleasure." The truth of this view may be argued from the following considerations:

1. *From the necessity of the case.* Children, as "born of the flesh," are by nature children of wrath; and in order to be saved from perdition and qualified for heaven, they must become the subjects of pardoning mercy and regenerating grace. As "where sin abounded grace did much more abound," it follows, that to whatever penal consequences and depraving influences they became exposed through original sin entailed upon them by the fall of Adam, adequate provision hath been made to deliver them from its guilt and dominion through the redemption of Christ. As nearly one half of the human race die in childhood, provision must be made for their justification and regeneration, and it is rational to conclude, that God would devise some means adapted to its accomplishment. And as children were incapable of being "born again," like adults, through faith in the word, the Confessors believed that they were capable of being "born again of water and of

the Spirit through holy Baptism. And if, according to the general opinion, God effects the pardon and regeneration of all unbaptized children who die in infancy, without means in an extraordinary manner, it accords much more with his wisdom and goodness to conclude that he will make provision for accomplishing the same end through appropriate means. And if the approach of death becomes an adequate reason for an interposition of an extraordinary movement of grace towards them, their moral purification, usefulness and happiness in this life, as the precursor of that which is to come, becomes a more potent reason for a prevenient movement of grace towards them through Infant Baptism. And as by being "born of the flesh," they will "sow to the flesh," reap corruption and die; by being "born of water and of the Spirit," they will sow to the Spirit, and "from the Spirit reap everlasting life."

2. *From the progressive character of the work of fashioning and perfecting the new creature.* Man, under the operation of the workmanship of God, is created anew in Christ Jesus, and becomes a new creature. The terms begetment, quickening, birth and growth, which set forth the progressive stages in which, according to the laws of natural generation, the body of man is conceived and grows to maturity, are employed in a general sense by the inspired writers to exhibit the work of the new creation, and in their specific sense, they fitly describe the process in which, "according to the law of the Spirit of life," the new creature is fashioned, as well as the successive stages through which it must pass in order to attain perfection. And as Baptism is administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, it involves the supernatural begetment of the Father, the quickening of the Son, and the birth-throe of the Spirit, as well as the subsequent workmanship of the Triune God, in fashioning the new creature into the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus. As the Confessors adopted this comprehensive conception of regeneration, as the work of the new creation, they believed, according to the analogy of Scripture,

that as begetment involves all the natural forces which in their development fashion the old man in Adam, Baptism involves all the supernatural forces, which in their development form and perfect the new man in Christ Jesus.

3. *From the true conception of Church organization.* The Church of Christ is described in the Scriptures, not as a mechanical aggregation, but as a living organism—as a vine, an olive tree, a body, a family, a kingdom. As such she is pervaded by a supernatural life, even the life of Christ. In nature, atoms in their natural state, are unadapted to organization; but when brought into connection with a germ or life force, they are changed and assimilated by it, and incorporated into its body, and by such transformation alone can they become constituent parts of a living body. And to this there is a striking analogy in the sphere of the supernatural. It is not by mere accident that church organization is represented as an engrafting of branches into a vine or olive tree, and the insertion of members into an organized body. Even when the Church is represented as a house, building or temple composed of stones, the members are declared to be “lively stones” with which there is “built up a spiritual house.” Yea, Paul says to them, “ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God, through the Spirit.” Man in his natural condition, is morally dead, and while he remains in his inorganic state, he is unfit for ecclesiastical organization. But when brought into contact with Christ as the life force of redemption, he is quickened, changed, assimilated and incorporated as a living member into the Church, as his mystical body. Accordingly Paul declares that Christ is the head of the body, the Church; that all Christians “were baptized by one Spirit into one body;” that they thereby became “members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones;” and that through such a union with Christ, they would be able “to grow up in all things into him, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted

by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." This determines the qualifications, the means, the process and the results of church organization. Now, if it be the design of Christ that children should become members of his Church, as the Confessors believed, it becomes indispensable that they be transformed from a state of moral death into one of spiritual life. As the Baptism of water was the appointed means for imparting the Baptism of the Spirit to adults, and for preparing them for a living union with Christ, in his Church, and, as, according to divine appointment, the same means were to be applied to children, it follows that in order to meet the requirements of Church organization, and prepare them, as well as adults, to become true "members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones," their Baptism must also secure to them the gift of the Holy Ghost.

4. *From the indispensable conditions of Christian nurture.* The process and possibilities of Christian nurture are set forth analogically in the Scriptures. Men cannot gather "grapes from thorns nor figs from thistles." "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit." "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." No one "can bring a clean thing out of an unclean;" "that which is born of the flesh remains flesh;" and "the evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth evil things." Now, as by no process of cultivation one species of plant can be so modified as to become, and to bring forth the fruits of another species, so by no process of natural and rational culture can the depraved nature of man be changed, and the fruits of holiness brought forth by him.

Christian nurture consists in so cultivating the plants of grace in the husbandry of Christ, that they may flourish as trees of righteousness, and in so feeding the lambs of Christ, that they may become the sheep of his fold. In other words, it consists in so training the children of the covenant, that they may grow up into Christ, and be thoroughly furnished unto every good work as members of his Church. But with-

out the provision of supernatural agency and instrumentality, capable of transforming tares into wheat, goats into lambs, and the children born of the flesh into children born of the Spirit, spiritual growth, as the product of Christian nurture, becomes absolutely impossible. Such provision the Confessors maintained was made through the means of grace, Baptism securing the renewing agency of the Spirit, and the word furnishing the instrument of Christian nurture.

Stier in his "Words of the Lord Jesus," vol. viii, p. 317, expresses his views of the relation of Infant Baptism to Christian nurture as a theologian, and his feelings as a father, in the following explicit terms: "That there should be a Church which receives and educates children; that there should be a baptizer, acknowledging and representing the faith of the mother-church, who would invoke for them the Triune God—is necessary, but it is also enough. Thus the grace of him that calleth (that the fulfilment may not come behind the type, Rom. 9 : 11,) the germ out of which the tree of their Christian life is developed under spiritual culture, is one necessary foundation of Christian *education*—of their nurture *in* Christ, and not merely *into* Christ. As a Christian father, I could never regard one of my children as still standing without the grace of regeneration, and not yet taken into the covenant and promise through the sacrament appointed *to that end*. The higher my estimation of this, the more deeply do I feel its need for my children as for myself; and moreover, I have no notion of any such education, as should, apart from the divine foundation, prepare them for and lead them to Baptism. The more stress we are in fact obliged to lay upon the blessing, the sanctification and the union with the Church, of a child growing up in strict Christian culture, the more must his subsequent Baptism lose of its importance; it must in fact appear to be a mere supplementary ceremony of water."

5. *From the declarations of Christ concerning the manner in which little children are made meet for the kingdom of God.* The instructions given by Jesus Christ—in regard to the relation of children to his Kingdom or Church, heretofore quoted,

establish the logical connection of the following propositions, viz.: that children born of the flesh, will, until born of the Spirit, develop the moral characteristics of the flesh, remain among the "lost" and "perish;" that it is not the will of God that one such little child should perish, and that Christ came to seek and to save them; that in order to be saved they must enter the kingdom of heaven; and that no conceivable rational instrumentality invented by man can so change their nature, as to qualify them for admission into it; that in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, they must be "born of water and of the Spirit," and that to effect this new birth, a supernatural instrumentality must be originated and applied to them by divine agency; that Baptism has been appointed by Christ as the means, and the Holy Spirit sent as the agent for its accomplishment; that Christ having commanded his Apostles to make disciples, by baptizing them in his name and receiving them into his kingdom, also enjoined that little children should be received by them in his name; and as there is no other way of doing this revealed in the Scriptures, except through Baptism, they did baptize the children of believing parents and receive them also into his kingdom: that children thus received in his name came to Christ, received the kingdom of heaven, and became members of it; that having entered the kingdom of heaven through Baptism, they must have been "born of water and of the Spirit;" that adults must first be converted, in order to possess the same gracious qualifications for receiving and entering the kingdom of heaven; and that the kingdom of heaven, as constituted by Christ, consists of baptized children, and of adults, who, through conversion, become spiritually like them. The logical connection of these propositions cannot be broken, except by a violation of the rules of sound reasoning, nor can the conclusion which they demonstrate be resisted, save by the adoption of Anabaptist and Pelagian sentiments.

Christ did not, indeed, baptize the little children with water, but received them into his arms, laid his hands on them and **blessed them**. This could not have been an empty

ceremony, but was much rather a verification of the promise of the Abrahamic covenant. That promise was: "In thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Christ was the seed of Abraham; (Gal. 3) he redeemed man, in order "that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles," and that they "might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." "The blessing of Abraham" was, consequently, the Holy Spirit. The Son received from the Father "the promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2 : 33) and ministered or dispensed the Spirit, (Gal. 3 : 5.) As Christ baptized the Apostles with the Holy Ghost, through "cloven tongues, like as of fire," and thus fulfilled the promise of the Spirit made unto them; as Peter expressly declared that "the promise" of the Spirit, which was "the blessing of Abraham," pertained also to "children, (Acts 2 : 39) as Christ, who ministereth the Spirit, laid his hands on them and blessed them, and as by the laying on of hands, the Apostles dispensed the Spirit, the Confessors believed, that Jesus, the seed of Abraham, "blessed" the children with "the blessing of Abraham," that is, with the Holy Spirit, thus fulfilling the promise of the covenant made with Abraham, and preparing them for and admitting them into his kingdom.

6. *From the specific office of Baptism as a divine ordinance.* While Baptism belongs to the same species of instrumentality with the word and the Lord's Supper, it is, nevertheless, not identical with either of them. As a means of grace, it is distinguished from the word. Through the written word remission of sins is preached and the Holy Spirit offered to all who repent and believe; through Baptism, the "visible word," the remission of sins is sealed and the gift of the Holy Ghost conferred upon the individual believer. The promise of universal grace is repeated whenever the eye rests upon the sacred page, or the lips of the preacher open to proclaim it, and the sound thereof reverberates throughout all the earth, the promise of personal grace offered by Baptism is never repeated, but concentrated upon the individual, and stands good and available to him through life. As a sacrament, Baptism is also distinguished from the Holy Eucharist.

Like the Lord's Supper, it is a symbol—the Supper showing the Lord's death—Baptism exhibiting the cleansing power of his blood, the washing away of sins. Like the Lord's Supper, it is a communion—the Supper the communion of the body and blood of Christ—Baptism the communion of the Holy Ghost. Now, as the specific office of the Lord's Supper was the communion of the body and blood of Christ, broken and shed for the remission of sins, the specific office of Baptism, is the communion of the Holy Spirit, who washes away all sin. If Paul could, therefore, truly say: "The bread which we break—is it not the communion of the body of Christ? the cup of blessing which we bless—is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" he might just as truly have said: The water which we pour, in the name of him who ministereth the Spirit—is it not the communion of the Holy Ghost? As advocates of Infant Baptism, the Confessors did not believe that Baptism, when administered to children, lost its essential constituents and became an empty ceremony, but, on the contrary, maintained that it retained its specific office, and, consequently, must wash away their original sin, and confer upon them the Holy Spirit.

7. *From the sacramental interpretation of the passages of Scripture relating to Baptism.* "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." "The Ark, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water, the like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us." In these passages a certain relation is declared to exist between Baptism and the birth and renewal of the Spirit, sanctification and salvation. What the precise nature of the relation is, is not expressly stated. According to the Romish view of the sacraments, the relation is that of cause and effect, and the operation magical; according to the Zwinglian, the rela-

tion is that of symbol and thing symbolized, and the operation merely exhibitiv; according to the Lutheran, the relation is that of a means to an end, and the operation sacramental. These divergent views have given rise to three distinct methods of interpretation, the literal, figurative, and sacramental. The Confessors adopted the sacramental interpretation, according to which Baptism becomes the medium of communicating the Holy Spirit to both children and adults, through which and the word, as means of grace, he works faith, effects the new birth and renewal, sanctification and salvation. And this interpretation is exegetical of the baptismal formula, according to which, to be baptized INTO the name of the Triune God, is to be baptized into communion with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Entertaining this profound view, Stier says: "Thus this NAME, and in and with it, the uttered, attested, revealed nature of God, is actually the wonderful virtue of the water of Baptism, as bound up in the institution for all futurity, the true water of the word (Eph. 5 : 26) in which the Church is further to be cleansed and sanctified unto perfection. Beginning, sum and kernel of this word is the name of God, in which life and power are communicated by means of the Spirit. * * * And because the Father and the Son work upon and within men, and enter them by the Holy Spirit, this third name is here the decisive and completing name. Therefore the first promise of the beginning—baptism ran quite rightly, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." But we also know in what way apostolic doctrine interchangeably supplements the words—The baptized are incorporated into the Son (1 Cor. 12 : 13; Gal. 3 : 27; Rom. 6) and have put on Him, that is, finally, as the children of God the Father." The words of the Great Commission, authorizing the baptism of all nations INTO the name of the Triune God, involve, according to their true import, being baptized into the communion of the Holy Ghost, as well into the fellowship of the Father, and of his Son, Jesus Christ.

This is the doctrine of "baptismal grace" (*tauf gnade*) held by the Confessors. The grace offered and imparted through

Baptism embraces specifically the Holy Spirit, and with him, generally all the promises of the gospel. Children through such Baptism are offered to God, become acceptable to him, and are received into his favor. The phrase employed to designate the effect of the reception of the Holy Ghost, and through which they become acceptable to God, and qualified for the kingdom of heaven, is that of the new birth. Hence they call Baptism "a laver of regeneration," and speak of being "born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit." While these phrases are specifically applied to adults, who are born again by faith, and fully explained in exhibiting the doctrine of regeneration, there is no such specific application and explanation made of them to children, and their general reference to them is explained by the general terms quoted above. This proves the caution of the Confessors as well as their moderation, in setting forth the benefits of Infant Baptism.

The individual sentiments of the Confessors, on the efficacy and benefits of Infant Baptism, are more fully expressed in their other writings. Melancthon, who worded the IX. Article of the Confession and explained more fully its meaning in the Apology, in discussing the subject of Pædo-baptism, expresses himself as follows: "In and by Baptism the Holy Spirit is given to children, who operates in them according to their measure (*masse*) or capacity, as he operated in John in the womb of Elizabeth. And although there is a difference between the old and the young, inasmuch as the old are attentive to the works, still the influences of the Spirit are, in both old and young, a tendency towards God." Luther, in explaining the effects of Baptism, confines himself mainly to the interpretation of the declarations of Scripture concerning the new creation, as the special work of the Holy Spirit. As man is naturally "dead in sin," Luther held that God through the grace of Baptism, "constitutes out of the old, inanimate man, a saint with a new principle of life." As all men, born of the flesh, must be born of the Spirit, he believed that "the spiritual birth took its rise

in Baptism as the washing of regeneration." As all men must put off the old and put on the new man, he maintained that "in Baptism the Holy Spirit, grace and virtue are given to suppress the old man, that the new may come forth and increase." As all men who are alive in sin must die unto sin and live to God, he taught that "we are buried with Christ by Baptism into death, that like as he rose from the dead, so we also should walk in newness of life." The work of the new creation as above described, involves a spiritual quickening, spiritual birth, spiritual mortification, and spiritual growth on earth, culminating in spiritual perfection in heaven. And as this is especially the work of the Holy Spirit, conferred through Baptism, Luther held that the Spirit commenced the new birth with its administration by imparting "a new principle of life" and awakening a "lively susceptibility for God," which he calls faith.

Reinhard says, that the position that faith is imparted to children through Baptism is to many Lutheran theologians objectionable, involves no insignificant difficulties, and cannot be established from the Scriptures. Good says that while "the early divines of the Protestant churches did not generally adopt precisely Luther's view, and express themselves as if they considered an infant capable of the acts of faith, they did speak of an infant as capable of the seed, or principle or incipient stage of faith." Heim, the Wurtemberg pastor, writes, as quoted by Stier, "The Reformers with all their deep conviction of the internal character of Christianity, were yet, in respect to their understanding of the truth, too much bound up in externality of thought and discursive reasoning. Hence it came to pass that the question was agitated with so much asperity, whether children could have faith, for while this contradicts the natural reason of man, it yet could not be denied, according to the notions of the old theologians, without making Baptism a mere empty formality, or a merely conditional assurance for the future. The simple answer would have been, that by Baptism itself the germ, from which the tree of faith would grow, was placed in the soul as the seed of life from God." The same view was held

by Calvinistic divines. Calvin maintains "a seed of faith in infants;" Ursinus "an inclinatory faith." Voetius holds that "there is in them a root, faculty, supernatural principle, seed or nursery, from whence in its own time faith springs up." Peter Martyr says that faith in infants is "incipient in its principle and root, inasmuch as they have the Holy Spirit, whence faith and all virtues flow forth." While all Lutherans regard Baptism as a means of grace, they also believe that when administered to children, according to the Scriptures, it does not lose its essential characteristics and become an empty ceremony, but that it performs its specific office, as the medium of imparting to them special blessings. But in the specific enumeration of these blessings, and the explanation of the precise effects produced by them in the minds and hearts of children, they express themselves in different terms.

Dr. C. F. Schaeffer (*Evangelical Review*, vol. viii. p. 339,) says: "We do not therefore insist on the word *Faith*, when we desire to designate the effect produced in the babe's soul by Baptism through the operation of the Spirit; * * we simply ascertain from the Scriptures the fact itself, that in Baptism a change influencing a child's moral nature has been actually wrought, and this change which tends to render the child acceptable to God, may analogically be called *Faith*, or inasmuch as this change actually amounts to the production of a spiritual life in the soul, we may call it a spiritual birth, or adopting the Scripture term denominate it *regeneration*."

Dr. C. P. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 579,) explains it as follows: "Faith as an *act*, like sin as an *act*, presupposes a *condition* of mind, which condition is the principal thing in both cases, to which the act is merely phenomenal. * * By nature the infant is as really a sinner, and by grace as really a believer, as the adult is, though it can neither *do* sin nor *exercise* faith. It *has* sin by nature and it *has* faith by grace. Working out under the law of the first condition, it will inevitably *do* sin, as, under the law of the second, it will *exercise* faith. Faith justifies by its *receptivity* alone. There is no justifying merit in faith as an act, nor is there

any in the acts it originates. In the adult it is divinely wrought, it "is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." In the infant there is wrought by God, through the Holy Ghost, by means of the water and the word, that *receptivity* of condition, which it has not by nature. The Holy Ghost offers grace, and so changes the moral nature of the child, that this nature becomes receptive of the grace offered. This divinely wrought condition we call receptive faith, and though its phenomena are suspended, it is really faith, and involves what is essential to justification, as does the faith of the adult.

Dr. B. Kurtz (*Infant Baptism*, p. 156, 157,) bears the following testimony: "We have already remarked that we do not feel warranted to define the nature and measure of this blessing (*viz.* that of Baptism). It may be, for aught we know, the gift of the Holy Ghost 'in those secret spiritual influences, by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected, and which is a *seed of life* in those who are spared, to prepare them for instruction in the word of God, as they are taught it by parental care, to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure." * *

* * "Baptism is, in an eminent degree, the emblem of moral purification by the new birth, and may even become the blessed means of that birth. But the uniform agent in effecting that birth, is the Holy Spirit. These remarks appear to favor the notion, that the influences of the Spirit may possibly constitute the blessing conveyed to children at their Baptism. That those influences become immediately active is not maintained by us, because the infant is not as yet a moral agent, or capable of intelligent or responsible action, but so soon as he arrives at the age of discretion, he may seriously meditate on his relations as a member of the Church, and the blessing imparted at his Baptism may become effectual to his conversion and salvation, or if he die before he reaches that age, the same blessing may become alike efficient, in renewing his nature and qualifying him for heaven.

Dr. S. S. Schmucker, in his *Popular Theology*, p. 273, 274, teaches that the Scriptures represent Baptism to adult believers "as a means for obtaining the remission of sins," and also "as a means of regeneration." It is termed the washing of regeneration, and yet it is admitted that regeneration is effected by the Holy Spirit through the means. The agency of the Spirit is distinctly associated by the Saviour himself with Baptism, "one of whose special advantages consists 'in the immediate influences of the Holy Spirit.'" "Baptism in infants (Definite Synodical Platform, p. 31) is the pledge of the bestowment of those blessings purchased by Christ for all." "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And "the promise is to you and your children," Acts 2 : 39. Those blessings are forgiveness of sins, or exemption from the penal consequences of natural depravity, (which would at least be exclusion from heaven, on account of moral disqualification for admission,) reception into the visible Church of Christ, grace to help in every time of need, and special provision for the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to which parents pledge themselves."

He had taught (*Pop. Theol.*, p. 148) that as "the atonement not only delivered its subjects from punishment, but purchased for them a title for heaven, it follows that children (who are embraced in it) not having lost their title by voluntary unbelief, will for Christ's sake enjoy the benefit of it, that is, that at death their corruptible nature shall be transformed into an incorruptible, and their mortal into an immortal one, and they, liberated from their moral disease, be ushered into the blissful presence of Him who said: "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Now, as God would thus remove the guilt and corruption of original sin from unbaptized children dying in infancy, in an extraordinary manner without means, and as the specific office of Baptism is to seal the remission of sins and confer the Holy Spirit upon adults, consistency demanded that it must, unless it cease to be Baptism and become something else, perform the same office when administered to children. He

accordingly admits that through Baptism God "bestows upon children forgiveness of sins" and "removes their moral disqualification for admission into heaven," which can be nothing else but the application of the redemption remedy for their "moral disease" (natural depravity) through the influence of the Holy Spirit. If this be not his meaning, then his statement involves two insuperable difficulties. The first is, that Baptism, when administered to children, must be split into two, the one half, which seals the remission of original sin, being present, but the other half, which confers the Holy Spirit, being absent, and, of course, inoperative. The second difficulty is, that if Baptism only removes the penal consequences of original sin, and fails to provide grace to overcome the dominion of its sinful influence, through the Holy Spirit, it would provide only for one of the evils entailed by original sin, and leave the other, no less important, unprovided for, and present the baptized child in an anomalous condition in the moral universe, justified and saved from hell, but unregenerate and unfit for heaven. And the declaration that Baptism furnishes the child with "grace to help in every time of need," must prove delusive, unless it confers the Holy Spirit, through whose influence alone it can be born of God, and trained as his child, through Christian nurture in the Church of Christ. But that Dr. Schmucker did mean what we have said, is clear from the declaration made by him in his *Lutheran Manual*, p. 141, "As to the benefits of Baptism to children, it may be said that, in addition to being admitted by it into the visible Church of Christ, and securing the advantages of a religious Christian education, this ordinance confers on them all the other benefits that it does on adults (including, of course, remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost) so far as they are capable of receiving them."

It is manifest that the conception of baptismal grace runs through all the explanations just given, and that the blessings conferred by Baptism upon children, are set forth by these Lutheran theologians in terms stronger than those employed by the Confessors themselves. As regards the explanations given, they must be regarded as human efforts to ex-

plain what the Scriptures left unexplained, and be taken for what they are worth on their intrinsic merits. The inspired writers do, indeed, employ the terms, which describe the stages of natural germination, generation and growth, to represent the work of the Spirit in planting and training trees of righteousness, and in bringing forth and fashioning new creatures in Christ Jesus. If Peter, therefore, calls the word of God, as one of the means, the "seed" of regeneration, Baptism, as another means of regeneration, may be designated by the same term. And if James declares that God, through "the word of truth" confers the begetting of the Spirit, we may, for similar reasons affirm that through Baptism, he confers the birth of the Spirit. But the inspired writers expressly tell us, that the processes of the Spirit in the work of regeneration are mysterious and inexplicable. "The sacrament," says Stier, "is a matter of faith and not of demonstration." We must, therefore, receive the declarations of Scripture concerning the efficacy of Baptism by faith, without attempting to prove it by ocular demonstration or metaphysical explanations.

The Lutheran doctrine of "Baptismal grace," is also taught in the catechism and liturgies adopted by the General Synod. In the "Order of Salvation," the following questions and answers occur. 88. "How does the Holy Ghost enlighten and sanctify us?" "The Holy Ghost works in us faith in Christ, and makes us entirely new creatures." 92. "When did the Holy Ghost begin this sanctification in you?" "In the holy ordinance of Baptism, the Holy Ghost began this sanctification in me," Titus 3: 5, 7. 93. "What did God promise you in holy Baptism?" "God promised and also bestowed upon me, the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation," Acts 2: 38; 1 Pet. 3: 21. 94. "But what did you promise God?" "I promised that I would renounce the devil and all his works, and all his ways, and believe in God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," Rom. 6: 2, 3; James 4: 7; Hosea 2: 19, 20; Rev. 2: 10. 95. "Through whom did you make this promise in holy Baptism?" "I made this promise in holy Baptism through my parents or sponsors?" 96. "Are all baptized

persons holy and pious?" "No, many fall from their baptismal covenant," 2 Pet. 2 : 20, 22. 97. "Whereby does a person fall from his baptismal covenant?" "By wilful sin we fall from our baptismal covenant," Is. 59 : 2. 99. "How can such a wilful sinner be sanctified again?" "He can be sanctified again through the word of God," John 17 : 7; James 1 : 21. 100. "But to what does the word of God exhort us?" "The word of God exhorts us to repentance and conversion," Matt. 3 : 2; Acts 2 : 38. Under the conviction that grace is offered in Baptism through the Holy Spirit, the following petitions are found in the baptismal formulas for infants in both the first and second liturgies of the General Synod. "And now, when he (she) has been baptized according to the institution of our blessed Redeemer, we pray that he (she) may also be regenerated by the Holy Spirit; that he (she) may die unto sin, live unto righteousness, be incorporated into thy holy Church, and rendered a partaker of eternal life." "We bring this child to thee to be baptized. Take him as thine own, and bestow upon him all the blessings that flow from the 'washing of regeneration.' Bring him to a saving knowledge of thy truth, that his soul may be truly converted to thee. Sanctify him by thy Spirit, that he may be delivered forever from the power of sin and satan, and that by receiving the spirit of adoption, he may inherit eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

But the doctrine of baptismal grace was neither originated, nor first discovered by Luther and the Reformers. It was found in the Scriptures by the primitive Church, and practically illustrated in her organization and development. It was involved in the œcumenical creeds and taught by the fathers. Origen states it as follows: "According to the usage of the Church, Baptism is given even to infants, when, if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of Baptism would seem to be superfluous. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. No one is free from pollution, though he has lived but one day upon earth. And because by Baptism native pollution is taken away, therefore infants are baptized." It was also defended

by Augustine, the champion of orthodoxy, and even inconsistently admitted by Pelagius.

Augustine asks: "Why are infants baptized for the remission of sins, if they have no sin?" Pelagius replies: "Who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized, and born again in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of God?" Augustine further says: "In baptized infants, the Holy Spirit dwelleth, though they know it not. So know they not their own mind—they know not their own reason, which lies dormant, as a feeble glimmer, which is to be aroused with the advance of years."

The doctrine of baptismal grace is not, however, confined to the Lutheran Church, but is also held by other Protestant denominations. The Moravians accepted it, by the adoption of the Augsburg Confession. The Church of England appropriated it in compiling her Thirty-Nine Articles and her liturgical formulas from Lutheran sources. The Calvinistic Churches have differed from the Lutheran in their statements concerning the grace of Baptism, as well as the extent of its availability, limiting its blessings to elect infants. But so repugnant do their representations appear in the light of the Scriptures and the universally received faith of the Church, prior to the rise of Calvinism, that many of their ablest divines have modified their opinions and embraced in substance, if not in form, the Lutheran doctrine. They have maintained that justification and regeneration are not only signified and sealed, but also *imparted* in Baptism, either to all infants, or at least to the elect. Calvin says to Melancthon: "I grant that the efficacy of the Spirit is present in Baptism, so that we are washed and regenerated. We deny that infants cannot be regenerated by the power of God, which is as easy to him as it is wonderful and mysterious. But as they (the objectors) think it would be such a great absurdity for any knowledge of God to be given to infants, to whom Moses denies the knowledge of good and evil, I would beg them to inform me, what danger can result from our affirming that they already receive some portion of that grace, of which

they will ere long enjoy the full abundance." Accordingly the late Dr. Miller, of Princeton, as quoted by Dr. Kurtz, observed: "A gracious God may even then (at the moment when the ordinance is administered) accompany the outward emblem with the blessing which it represents, even the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." The late Dr. A. A. Alexander, Professor in the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, expresses his views on the subject of baptismal grace in the following explicit terms, and maintains that his sentiments are in perfect accordance with the doctrines received as orthodox by the Presbyterian Church: "I do maintain that *the germ of spiritual life* may be communicated to the soul of an infant, which, of course, remains inactive as does the principle of sin, until, &c.—this development is altogether by the word, &c.—But the doctrine that infants are incapable of being regenerated, until they are capable of attending to the word, is in my opinion fraught with consequences, *subversive* of our whole system. For, if infants are incapable of a holy principle, the same must be true of a sinful principle, and then the whole doctrine of birth-sin or *natural depravity* is set aside. It may remove some obscurity from the subject to say, that we are accustomed in treating the subject of regeneration with accuracy, TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN IT AND CONVERSION. *The one is the communication of spiritual life, the other is its exercise.* Suppose a dead seed to be impregnated with a vital principle, and you have my idea of regeneration." *Life of A. A. Alexander*, p. 587.

"And what time in infancy is more likely to be the period of spiritual quickening, than the moment when that sacred rite is performed, which is strikingly emblematic of this change. Whether it be proper to say, that Baptism may be the *means* of regeneration, depends upon the sense in which the word *means* is used. If in the sense of presenting motives to the rational mind, as when the word is read or heard, then it is not a *means*, for the child has no knowledge of what is done for it. But if by *means* he meant something that is accompanied by the divine efficiency, changing the moral nature of the infant, then, in this sense, Baptism may be called

the means of regeneration, when thus accompanied by divine grace." *Religious Experience*, p. 38.

In comparison with the specific and emphatic declarations made by the distinguished Reformed and Lutheran theologians, quoted above, in regard to Infant Baptism and its gracious efficacy, how moderate do not the representations of our Lutheran Confessors appear. They affirm, "That through Baptism the grace of God is offered, that children are to be baptized, and being through Baptism offered to God, become acceptable unto him, and are received into his favor." And further, "That children are to be baptized, in order that they may become participants of the gospel, that is of the promises of the Holy Spirit, grace and salvation, which belong not only to adults, but also unto children; for in and with Baptism universal grace and the treasures of the gospel are offered to them."

The doctrine of baptismal grace, thus set forth by the Confessors, is sustained by the Holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the most learned and profound commentators of ancient and modern times; it was confessed by the primitive Church and defended by the Christian fathers; it was corrupted and abused by the Romanists, but it has been accepted by the great majority of the Protestants. It supplies the spiritual wants of the children in the family, and imposes the obligation of Christian nurture upon parents; it builds up the Church, by affording adequate incentives to the religious training of the young; it promotes the stability of the State, and advances the moral progress of the nations. Perverted and misapplied by some, misapprehended and assailed by others, it has, nevertheless, maintained the ascendancy in the Lutheran household of faith. And as it could not be overthrown, neither will it be abandoned, but rather maintained in its scriptural and confessional integrity.

ITS NECESSITY.

In the Latin text of the Confession, the Confessors declare that "Baptism is necessary to salvation." But as this phraseology was liable to be misunderstood, they omitted the

words "to salvation" in the German edition, and simply affirmed that "Baptism is necessary." And to guard still more against the misinterpretation of the language employed, Melancthon added to the Latin form of the declaration concerning the necessity of Baptism to salvation, in subsequent editions, the explanatory phrase, "as a ceremony instituted by Christ."

They predicated its necessity upon the declaration and command of Christ, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3 : 5. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," Matt. 28 : 19. And as Christ instituted Baptism as a ceremony through which all his followers should be initiated into his Church, and enjoined its observance upon them, it becomes necessary to be baptized, in order that obedience may be rendered to his command, and all the blessings of the kingdom of God secured.

But Baptism was not regarded by the Confessors as necessary *per se*, but as a means through which God offers his grace : not necessary unconditionally, but conditioned upon the possibility of receiving it ; not necessary absolutely, but ordinarily as a moral obligation, imposed by the word and institution of Christ. Accordingly, a distinction must be made between that which is essential and that which is merely necessary. Being "born of the Spirit" is absolutely essential to an entrance into the kingdom of God ; being "born of water" relatively necessary. The internal renewing of the Holy Ghost," is unconditionally essential to salvation ; the outward "washing of regeneration" ordinarily necessary.

In consistency with these discriminating statements, the Lutheran Church has not held that Baptism was absolutely necessary to salvation. Accordingly Luther says : that not the deprivation of Baptism, but the contempt of it, condemns a man—and that although God binds us to the means as the ordinary instruments of his grace, he is not himself limited by them. The dying thief, though unbaptized,

ascended to Paradise, while Simon Magus, notwithstanding his Baptism, remained "in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity." And in like manner, "as children also belong to the promised redemption effected by Christ," and ought on that account to be baptized, nevertheless, should their Baptism be neglected prior to death, they would not, on that account, be excluded from heaven. In other words, children dying in infancy out of the Church, even those of the heathen, are saved without Baptism, through the saving efficacy of the redeeming work of Jesus Christ, and the extraordinary operation of the Holy Spirit.

Baumgarten says: "The necessity of Baptism is not an absolute, unconditional necessity, but a moral obligation, which presupposes and requires an outward opportunity."

Cotta, as quoted by Dr. Krauth, maintains the salvation of infants by the following considerations: "1. From the infinite pity of God. 2. The extent of the benefits wrought by Christ. 3. The analogy of faith—no one absolutely reprobated, but actual unbelief alone condemns. 4. Not the absence but the contempt of Baptism condemns. 5. God can operate in an extraordinary way. 6. Though original sin, *in itself*, merits damnation, and is a *sufficient* cause of it, yet it is not, (because of God's infinite goodness,) an *adequate* cause of the actual infliction of the condemnation."

Luther, while he held that Baptism was necessary to salvation in general, says in reference to the children of Christians who have died unbaptized; "The holy and merciful God will think kindly upon them. What he will do with them, he has revealed to no one, that Baptism may not be despised, but has reserved to his own mercy: God does wrong to no one." And as regards children in general, he says: "God has not bound himself to the sacraments, so as not to do otherwise, without the sacraments. So I hope that the good and gracious God has something good in view for those who, not by any guilt of their own, are unbaptized."

ITS ADAPTATION.

Wisdom is exhibited in the adaptation of means to the at-

tainment of ends The provisions of redemption show the manifold wisdom of God. Baptism as a divine ordinance must, therefore, be characterized by adaptation.

1. *Baptism is adapted to the presentation of children to God.* Children are said to be a heritage from the Lord, who is the framer of their bodies and the father of their spirits. Hence he says: "All souls are mine;" Ezek. 18 : 4. The gift of a child is therefore the greatest earthly blessing which God can confer upon parents, and it is befitting that they should recognize his claims, and dedicate it to his service. Accordingly, God required parents to offer every male child to him through circumcision, and to present to him besides all the first born, the males being thus specially set apart for the priesthood. They were regarded as holy unto the Lord, and their parents brought them to the temple and presented them to God, accompanied with an appropriate offering, Ex. 13 : 2. Numb. 8 : 17. In accordance with these directions, Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day after his birth, and presented unto the Lord in the temple at the end of forty days by Joseph and Mary.

The relation which God bears to children as their Creator and his claims to them, their moral wants and the blessings necessary to supply them and secure their spiritual interests, are not limited to periods, but remain the same in all generations. The reasons which induced God to require parents to present their children to him during the Jewish, would lead him to make the same requisition upon them in the Christian dispensation. And as the distinctions between Jew and Gentile, male and female, the first born child and the other children, were all to be removed, it was necessary that circumcision, which was more particularly adapted to such limitations, should be superseded. And as by faith the Gentiles became the seed of Abraham, and male and female became one in Christ, and every believer became sanctified unto God, and every child of a believing parent became "holy" unto the Lord, it became necessary that a rite should be substituted for circumcision, adapted to the universality, which was to

characterize the Christian dispensation, and Baptism was chosen to meet all these requisitions.

It would, therefore, be expected that provision should be made for the presentation of children to God in the Christian Church. This, it seems to us, is clearly taught by Paul (1 Cor. 7 : 14): "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." According to the ceremonial law certain things were regarded as clean (holy) and others as unclean. The unclean could not be offered to God, and that which was holy would alone be accepted by him. Now, Paul declares that according to divine arrangement the faith of the believing husband or wife so sanctifies the unbelieving one that the children born to them become holy, and can properly be offered unto the Lord. This idea with which the Jews were so familiar, and under the promptings of which they had been accustomed to present their children to God for ages, doubtless actuated the parents who brought their infants to Christ, induced him to accept them, and led him to institute Baptism as a rite, in all respects adapted to the presentation of children to God, and their consecration to his service. Accordingly, the Confessors taught in the article under consideration, that "children, through Baptism, are presented or offered to God," received into his favor, and recognized as his sons and daughters.

2. *Baptism is adapted to the religious training of children.* A child is born into the world in a state of ignorance, depravity and helplessness. It is endowed with intellectual and moral faculties, upon the proper development of which will depend its course of conduct and character in this life, as well as its destiny in that which is to come. Accordingly God has made ample provision in the establishment of his Church for the religious training of the young.

The process through which the results of religious training may be secured in the Church, is represented in the Scriptures, as analagous to that through which the results of culture are attained in nature. A plant, remaining in its orig-

inal position and subjected to the forces of nature surrounding it, will grow to maturity naturally. But if it be transplanted, and subjected to a change of climate, soil, light, heat and moisture, it may be greatly modified in size, form, texture and even in its nature. Every child naturally engendered "is conceived and born in sin," and if left to develop, "its evil desires and propensities" under the influence of the errors and example of the world, it will grow up in wickedness, and remain a child of wrath exposed to condemnation. But through Infant Baptism, a child may be taken up from the world, initiated into the Church, subjected to Christian nurture, and transformed by baptismal grace into a child of God and an heir of eternal life. Furthermore, by strewing the pollen of one species of plant upon the pistils of another, a still greater modification may be effected and a new variety of plant produced, whose life force will differ from and yet resemble that of each of the parent plants. And in like manner may the animal and rational life of a child be so modified under the forces of baptismal grace and Christian nurture, as to become a spiritual life differing from each and yet resembling both. It still retains its animal life with its appetitive propensities, as well as its rational life with its intellectual and moral faculties, but the spiritual life, superinduced upon them by the Holy Spirit, becomes regnant over both, and through conscience, its motive power, regulates the appetitive cravings of the animal, as well as the moral dictates of the rational nature, and thus secures the end of religious training, "walking in newness of life." In this, according to Luther "consists the efficacy and work of Baptism, which are nothing else but the mortification of the old Adam, and afterwards the rearing up of the new man, both of which are to be pursued through our whole life, so that a Christian life is nothing more than a daily Baptism, once begun and ever to be continued."

In the light of Christian nurture, Infant Baptism attains its special significance and value. No degree of natural culture through purely rational means, can ever attain a transformation of nature and produce spiritual results. Religious

training, without Infant Baptism as a means of grace, becomes a human experiment, without any divine arrangement or special provision. The expectation may, indeed, be cherished, that the desired result will be attained, but it cannot carry with it the assurance given by God to parents who dedicate their children to him in Baptism, and bring them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and to whom he thus seals the promise of the covenant of grace, that he will be a God unto them, and their seed after them in all generations.

ITS COMPLEMENT.

The Christian Church, being a development of the Jewish, retains many of its distinguishing characteristics, as well as religious customs. Every Jewish male child was presented to the Lord, entered into covenant with him, the promise of which was sealed to it by circumcision. The child thus became a member of the Church of God. But as church membership required a profession of faith and obedience, and as the child was, by reason of its undeveloped capacities, incapable of making the requisite vow itself, the parent was required to make it in its name. That vow, according to the divine constitution of the family, was as obligatory upon the child as if it had been made by itself, and it was thereby pledged to assume and fulfil it as soon as it arrived at the age of discretion. It was enjoined upon parents to explain to their children the import of religious ordinances, to remind them of the nature and requirements of the vow made for them, at their circumcision, and to urge them to ratify the same in their own name. It was expected, that under the moulding power of religious training, carried on in the family and seconded by the instructions of the Church, every child would be fully prepared to make a personal profession of religion at the age of thirteen, when the circumcised children were called upon to confirm their vows, and were declared, by the laying on of hands, to be the sons of the congregation of Israel.

Infant membership, with all its Jewish concomitants, save

that Baptism has taken the place of circumcision, is retained in the Christian Church. The ancient covenant still stands—children are still commanded to enter into it—they are still unable to act for themselves—their parents are still bound to consecrate them to God, and make the required vows in their name, as well as to “bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”—The Church is still obligated to recognize their membership and to provide them with a religious training—the children are still bound at the age of discretion to ratify the vows made in their name at their baptism—and “the laying on of hands” is still retained as the most significant, appropriate and impressive mode of making a profession of religion, and they are thereby recognized as full members of the Christian Church and entitled to all its privileges.

This form of profession was called Confirmation. It originated among the Jews; it was adopted by the Church in the second century; and retained by the Confessors of the Lutheran Church “as a rite transmitted to us from the Fathers.” Confirmation is, consequently, the complement of Infant Baptism. Infant Baptism is the antecedent, Confirmation its consequent. In Infant Baptism, the child was dedicated to God by its parents, in Confirmation it dedicates itself to him. In Infant Baptism, the child entered into covenant with God by substitution, in Confirmation it ratifies that covenant in person. Through Infant Baptism, the child was placed in the school of Christ, in Confirmation it is recognized as a trained disciple of Christ. In Infant Baptism the grace of God was offered and conferred, in Confirmation, its transforming power is exemplified. In Infant Baptism, the child was apprenticed and subjected to a course of preparation, in Confirmation it enters upon the practice of the good profession of Christianity. By Infant Baptism, the child is admitted into the family of God, but although he be an heir, he is kept, during his minority, “under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the Father;” in Confirmation he is recognized as “lord of all,” and put in possession of his promised inheritance, embracing all spiritual bless-

ings on earth, and eventually the enjoyment of immortal glory in heaven.

ITS REJECTORS.

These are described by the Confessors as follows:

"The Anabaptists, who teach that Infant Baptism is improper, and that children are saved without Baptism, are condemned." Their erroneous sentiments are more fully set forth in the Form of Concord. They maintained the following propositions:

"1. That infants, which are not baptized, are not sinners in the sight of God, but are righteous and innocent; and that, consequently in their innocence they are saved without Baptism, of which they have no need. Thus they deny and reject the whole doctrine concerning original sin, and all that is connected with it."

"2. That infants are not to be baptized, until they attain the use of their reason, and are able to make a confession of faith themselves."

"3. That the children of Christians, since they are born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and the children of God, even without and prior to Baptism. For this reason they do not highly esteem Infant Baptism, nor promote it; contrary to the express words of the promise of God, which extends to those alone who keep his covenant and do not despise it. Gen. 17 : 9, 10."

The errors of the Anabaptists, condemned by the Confessors, embrace the denial of *Pedo*, as distinguished from Adult Baptism, the rejection of the doctrine of Original sin, and the maintenance of the salvation of infants on the ground of their natural innocence and holiness. Inasmuch, however, as these errors are refuted in the general discussion of the subject, no direct refutation is deemed necessary here, and we, therefore, content ourselves with the simple statement of them as found above. The principle objections made by the Anabaptists to Infant Baptism, are the following:

1. That there is no scriptural warrant for Infant Baptism. For an answer to this we refer to the argument already presented, under the head of the subjects of Baptism.

2. That faith is a universal prerequisite to the reception of Baptism, and that as children cannot believe, they are not proper subjects of Baptism. To the assertion, that faith is universally demanded as a prerequisite for Baptism, we reply, that it is contradicted by an examination of all the passages contained in the Scriptures referring to the subject. Nothing is said about faith as the indispensable condition of Baptism, even in the words of the institution, as contained in Matthew, and the same is true of the great majority of the scriptural references to Baptism. There are, however, a number of passages in which faith and repentance are made conditional for Baptism. The true interpretation of the baptismal passages must, therefore, be sought in the practice of the inspired writers. An examination of all the examples of Baptism administered by the Apostles proves, that they invariably insisted upon the exercise of repentance and faith, for the reception of Baptism on the part of adults, and just as invariably administered Baptism to the children composing their households, without requiring the exercise of faith from them.

To the assertion, that children cannot believe or have faith, we reply, that the Confessors did not hold that unconscious infants had truth apprehending and appropriative faith. When they describe the characteristics of justifying, regenerating, sanctifying and saving faith, they have reference to adults and not to infants. The faith of infants is not affirmed in the Confession, the subject is only incidentally alluded to in the Larger Catechism, and the individual sentiments of Luther are not quoted in any of the Symbolical Books. And even he only maintained that children had faith in a technical sense, and held it more as a matter of theological hypothesis, than as a positive dogma. He, accordingly, wisely abstained from introducing it either into the definition of Baptism contained in the Smalcald Articles, or the Small Catechism, and in the Larger one delivered the whole question about the faith of children to the Doctors as one of secondary importance. From all of which it becomes manifest, that the theory of the Anabaptists, that evangelical faith is an indispensable

prerequisite for the reception of Baptism, does not interpret all the passages of Scripture pertaining to the subject; that the individual hypothesis of Luther, that children have faith, and, consequently, meet the universal requirement demanded of adults, interprets the baptismal passages no better; but the theory of the Confessors, that Baptism is to be administered to adults as well as to their children on the ground of the faith of the parents alone, and not on that of their infant offspring, does interpret every inspired declaration concerning Baptism, and therefore proves itself to be the theory of Christ, illustrated by his Apostles.

3. That the benefits of the sacraments can only be secured through faith, and as children can have no faith, Baptism can confer on them no benefits. We have already seen, that in the earlier statements of Luther, the theory was stoutly maintained that faith was indispensable to the reception of the benefits of the sacrament, and that children had faith, and in consequence thereof became participants of its blessings. We have, however, also seen that he subsequently modified his theory in these respects, and expressed himself in a different manner. He accordingly says in his letter on Anabaptism as already quoted: "Faith indeed is not for the promotion of Baptism, *but Baptism for the promotion of faith.*" In accordance with this sentiment the Confessors declare that children are baptized in order that they may become participants of the promises of grace and the Holy Spirit, who, in his own time and place, works faith in them, through which all the treasures of the gospel offered in Baptism, become their inheritance.

4. That the predication of any blessing as the result of Infant Baptism, led unavoidably to a magical *opus operatum*. In regard to the divine operations in general, the Confessors rejected the fanatical notions of the enthusiasts, that God works in the minds and hearts of men "by a secret inspiration or a peculiar divine revelation." Relative to the efficacy of the sacraments, we have seen that they rejected the error of the Dominicans, "that God has placed a spiritual power in the water," as well as that of the Franciscans, "that Baptism

washes away sins through the will of God." The *opus operatum* of the Romanists, with its magical operation, they condemn as follows: "Our opponents have no certainty, nor can they correctly tell us, or state in clear and intelligible terms, how the Holy Ghost is given. They dream that by the simple bodily reception and use of the sacraments, *ex opere operato*, we obtain grace and receive the Holy Ghost, although the heart be entirely absent, as if the light of the Holy Ghost were so worthless, weak and futile." The Confessors held that there was but *one* Baptism, which was the means of imparting the Holy Spirit to adult believers, and as that same Baptism was to be administered to their children, and as their children needed the influences of the Holy Ghost just as much as their parents, it must, unless it should become a different species of Baptism, be the means of conferring on them the Holy Spirit also. The manner in which this takes place is through the administration of the ordinance according to the Scriptures, on the ground of the faith of the parents, and in answer to the prayers of the administrator, as the representative of the Church and the minister of God.

5. That to enter into covenant presupposes voluntary and intelligent action, and as children are incapable of apprehending and assenting to the terms of a covenant, no moral obligation can be imposed, and no special blessings can be conferred upon them through Baptism. In reply to this it must suffice to say, that God did, nevertheless, call upon children to enter into covenant with him; that he sealed unto them, through circumcision, great and invaluable blessings, that he threatened to cut off every child that did not in like manner enter into covenant with him; that on great public occasions, the children of the Israelites were present, and received special mention as entering into covenant with God as well as the adults, and thus became heirs with their fathers, of all the blessings of the covenants of promise. And as children were embraced in the covenants made by their parents, so too were they obligated to fulfil the stipulations thereof, according to the divine arrangement, just as much as if they had intelligently and voluntarily entered into the covenant them-

selves. And the same is true in regard to human covenants. We, as children, are bound by the covenants made by our fathers, and our children are bound by the compacts which we may make and ratify. And as we inherited the blessings of the covenants of our fathers, so will our posterity become the heirs of the inheritance of their fathers, as well as ours, to the remotest generations.

CONCLUSION.

From the foregoing discussion of the subject of Baptism, the character of the Confessors as reformers, and the manner in which they accomplished the work of the great Reformation become manifest. And while they thus transmit to us the treasures of wisdom gathered by them from the fields of experience, observation and the Scriptures, they not only challenge our admiration, but they become to us, their ecclesiastical descendants, worthy examples for our imitation.

In their presentation of the subject of Infant Baptism, the Confessors exhibit both unity and diversity of sentiment. They agreed in confessing that Infant Baptism has the divine sanction; that through it grace is offered to children, that the grace thus offered embraces remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost; and that children being thus offered to God, become acceptable to him, and are received into his favor. They differed in regard to the question, whether children had faith, and in what sense this could be consistently affirmed, the precise effects produced by the operation of the Spirit on their minds and hearts, as well as in regard to the precise period, manner and degree of his influence upon them. In so far as they allowed themselves to refer to this aspect of the subject at all, they did so with great circumspection, and expressed their various shades of thought in different terms.

On Baptism, as was their wont on almost all disputed subjects, the Confessors took a medium position. The extremes, which in the providence of God had arisen in the Church, were those championed by Rome and Munster. Between the magical *opus operatum* of the Romanists, and the spirit-

ualistic fanaticism of the Anabaptists, they were called upon to choose. Under the guidance of the Spirit, they took their position midway between these extremes, and expressed their judgment in the Augsburg Confession. And so clear and scriptural did their doctrine appear, that it met not only with the approval of the Lutherans, but also with that of the Reformed. At Marburg, Zwingli and his associates formally endorsed it, and the representatives of the Reformed did the same at the Wittenberg Conference. The Lutheran doctrine of Baptism unitedly confessed in the Wittenberg Concordia, as given by Dorner, was as follows: "The promise was valid also for infants, and was to be appropriated to them through the ministrations of the Church. Without regeneration there was, even for infants, no entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Infants indeed had no understanding, but the Holy Ghost exercised his power in them according to their measure, and thereby they pleased God. The way and manner of these operations were unknown, but it was certain that there were in them new and holy impulses, the inclination to believe in Christ and to love God, which was in a certain measure similar to the movements of those, which are otherwise possessed of faith and love."

The Confessors in setting forth the doctrine of Baptism, expressed their opinions with marked wisdom and great moderation. The proof of this will at once become apparent, by comparing their declarations, both as individuals and Confessors, with those of the theologians and Confessors of other denominations. The Westminster Confession says: "The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered, yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will in his appointed time." The Heidelberg Catechism declares "That Christ appointed **this** external washing with water, adding thereto **this promise**, that I am as certainly washed by his blood and Spirit **from** all the pollution of my soul, that is

from all my sins, as I am washed externally with water;" that to be thus baptized, "is to receive the remission of sins, and also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost;" and that, "as infants, as well as the adult, are included in the covenant and Church of God, and since redemption from sin by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, the author of faith, is promised to them no less than to the adult, they must therefore, by Baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also admitted into the Christian Church," &c. Wesley, as quoted by Curteis, says: "It is certain, that our Church (the Episcopal) supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are, at the same time 'born again,' and it is allowed, that the whole office for the baptism of infants, proceeds upon this supposition." Dr. Heppé, a distinguished modern Reformed theologian, in presenting quotations from Calvinistic authors, quotes Polanus as testifying, "That to those who are baptized, it is signified and sealed, that they (to whom the covenant of grace pertaineth) are received into the communion of the covenant of grace, are inserted into Christ, and his mystic body, the Church, are justified by God, for the sake of Christ's blood shed for us, and regenerated by Christ's Spirit." In order to estimate the force of these Calvinistic quotations, it must be remembered, that the grace of Baptism is held to pertain to the children of the elect, as well as to the parents themselves. In comparison with the above confessional deliverances, those of the Lutheran Confessors must be regarded as mild, and in comparison with the declarations of Heppé, and those heretofore quoted of Calvin, and Drs. Miller and Alexander, those of Luther and Melancthon, as already presented, appear very moderate.

The Confessors also discriminate in their confessional writings with special care between Adult and Infant Baptism, and in this respect, imitate the sacred writers. Christ and his Apostles exhibit the doctrine of Baptism in general, the qualifications for its reception, its relation to the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, regeneration and sanctification, union with Christ, church membership and salvation, in

clear and positive terms. These representations are of such a character as to convince the great majority of Christians, that Infant Baptism is taught and involved in them. And as there is but one Baptism instituted by Christ, and as that was administered to adult believers and their children, it follows, that whatever grace it is the specific office of Baptism to confer, of which children stand in need and are capable of receiving, it must offer and confer upon them. Nevertheless, the inspired writers abstain from declaring in express terms, what the specific benefits of Infant Baptism are, and leave them to be inferred from their general teaching on the subject. And this is precisely the course pursued by the Confessors. They take up the adult believer and assure him that by Baptism he is "born of water and of the Spirit," and that it is to him "the washing of regeneration," through which he may be "sanctified" and "saved." But when they come to treat of Infant Baptism in particular, they go no farther than to declare that grace is offered through Baptism; that children are thereby presented to God, who, through such Baptism, become acceptable to him, and are received into his favor. And in explanation of this, they content themselves with the assurance, that the promises of grace and of the Holy Spirit belong to children as well as to adults, and that they are baptized, in order that they may become partakers thereof.

In the domain of philosophy it has often occurred, that the disciples of the great masters have misapprehended their tenets, and perverted their principles, and thus become the propagandists of errors, which were baneful in their tendencies and brought reproach upon their names and systems. And the same thing has occurred in the domain of symbolism in the Lutheran Church. The wisdom and moderation of the Confessors in setting forth the doctrine of baptismal grace, have not always been imitated by those professing the Lutheran name. Their conceptions, forms of expression and manner of applying it, were discarded, and the doctrine so perverted as to be little better than the magical *opus operatum* of the Romanists. Such a perversion took place in the Piet-

istic era of the Church. "The so-called orthodox opponents of Spener," says Dorner, "were of opinion that there is a truly spiritual and divine theology even of the unregenerate;" that "piety is no essential requirement in a theologian, for the apodeictic mark of a true teacher is simply correctness of doctrine;" and that "saving power was transferred to knowledge "and inward experience of salvation only inferred from purity of doctrine." "The office of an orthodox teacher, even if he be ungodly, is self-efficacious. With this were connected hierarchical notions of the office of the Church and of so-called official grace. * * Thus the continued agency of the Holy Ghost was, in a deistic fashion, abolished by the ministry, by the Church and its means of grace, and the power belonging to the Spirit alone, represented as abdicated to these second causes. These were no longer regarded as mere *media* for his operation, but as exercising an independent agency, wherever access was allowed to them. A regenerating power being thus attributed, not only to the sacraments, but to correct doctrine and to notions, in the case of those who did not wickedly oppose them, the *opus operatum* of Romish doctrine, which works in all who *non ponunt obicem* was again reached, and an intellectual Pelagianism combined with a magical effect of grace."

Dr. S. Sprecher, in his Holman Lecture on Original Sin, (*Evangelical Review*, October, 1867), presents the doctrine of the Confessors, as follows: "The Confessors declare that all men naturally engendered, whether infants or adults, are born in sin, and that this inherent disease, and natural depravity *is sin*, and still condemns and causes eternal death to all who are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Ghost. * * I need not say, therefore, that the Confessors do not mean that God has no other way or means of regeneration, except those revealed in the Bible, or that unbaptized infants, from the mere absence or want of Baptism, are unregenerated, and dying in infancy are unprepared for heaven. They speak only of the revealed order of salvation, the way into which the gospel calls us, and in which those who hear the gospel have the only sure warrant and certain pledge of regenera-

tion. To subjects who have not the gospel, or are incapable of receiving it, this declaration does not refer. For aught it teaches all infants, baptized and unbaptized, may be regenerated and saved. But if regenerated and saved, they are regenerated and saved by the grace of God alone."

In regard to the perversion of the doctrine, by scholastic distinctions, Dr. Sprecher says: "Spener deplored the effects of it as little better than those of the Papal *opus operatum*, and it was a departure from original and true Lutheranism. * * While Spener regarded the conversion of Christians who had fallen into spiritual death, as a return to baptismal grace, yet he calls such conversion explicitly and emphatically a new regeneration, inasmuch as the baptismal regeneration (grace) had been entirely lost, and regarding this as the case of the vast majority of those baptized in infancy, he treated all who did not exhibit the evidences of spiritual life, as not only unconverted but unregenerate. * * As Luther returned to primitive Christianity, so did Spener return to early Lutheranism."

The terms employed by the Confessors, and the precise meaning attached to them in portraying the doctrine of baptismal grace, deserve special consideration. The words "faith" and "regeneration," as the synonym of "being born again," and "born of God," are frequently used by the sacred writers, and have a clear and well defined meaning. The Holy Ghost works faith through the Word and sacraments, and whosoever believes on the Son of God and is baptized is begotten of the word of truth, "born of water and of the Spirit," and receives "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." In this sense the Confessors employ these terms in their application to adults, but when they refer to Infant Baptism and its effects, both in the Confession and the Apology, they employ none of them, and express themselves in the general terms already quoted. And even when they employ the words "faith" and "regeneration" as applicable to baptized infants, it is done in a technical sense, which, in order to prevent misapprehension, they explain. But as these terms have their fixed meaning, and

will be understood accordingly, it is injudicious to use them in connection with Infant Baptism, without careful examination, and as the impression made by their ordinary meaning may be stronger than that made by the explanation of their technical meaning, it would, perhaps, be better to imitate the Confessors in this respect, and not employ them at all in defining Infant Baptism. We have already seen that Luther affirmed that children had "faith," and how he explained his meaning in the Wittenberg Concordia. He also employed the term "regenerate" and its synonyms in his Baptismal Formulas just as it had been used in the Romish service, but while he did this in deference to the prejudices of the people who had been accustomed to it, he employed it in the Evangelical and not in the Romish sense. He tells us this himself. "I did not wish to alter many things, though I could have wished that the Form was better furnished. For it had careless authors, who did not sufficiently consider the importance of Baptism. But I leave the most part unchanged, lest weak consciences complain that I have instituted a new Baptism, and lest those already baptized complain that they are not rightly baptized. For, as has been observed, human additions are not of much consequence, so that Baptism is itself administered with the word of God, *true faith, and earnest calling upon God.*"

The phrase "Baptismal Regeneration," was not employed by the Confessors, and it does not occur in the Symbolical Books. It is true that as the "*washing of regeneration,*" in Titus 3 : 5, refers to Baptism, the phrase "*baptismal regeneration*" would be its scriptural equivalent. But as it is not specifically applied by Paul to baptized infants, and as it is generally used to express the Romish doctrine of the *opus operatum*, it cannot be employed in setting forth the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal grace without constant liability to misstatement and misapprehension.

Dr. A. Alexander (Religious Experience, p. 37, 38,) says : "If piety may commence at any age, how solicitous should parents be for their children, that God would bestow his grace upon them, even before they know their right hand

from their left. And when about to dedicate them to God in Holy Baptism, how earnestly should they pray, that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost; that while their bodies are washed in the emblematic laver of regeneration, their souls may experience the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. If the sentiments expressed above be correct, then may there be such a thing as *baptismal regeneration*: not that the mere external application of water can have any effect to purify the soul, nor that internal grace uniformly or generally accompanies this external washing, but that God, who works when and by what means he pleases, may regenerate by his Spirit the soul of the infant, while in his sacred name water is applied to the body."

In his life by his son, Dr. Alexander refers to the misapprehension of his meaning, which had occurred, as follows: "If, however, I had foreseen the perversion which some have made of my real opinion, I would perhaps have avoided the use of the phrase "baptismal regeneration," but I have clearly explained that my meaning was, that as infants are capable of regeneration before the use of reason, that blessing might be granted at the moment when they were made the subjects of an ordinance which is intended to give an emblematical representation of that change."

The doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" has been defined by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, as follows: "By this designation is meant the doctrine that Baptism is necessarily and invariably attended by spiritual regeneration, and that such water Baptism is unconditionally essential to salvation." "Regeneration consists in a radical change in our religious views of the divine character, laws, &c., a change in our religious feelings, and in our religious purposes and habits of action, of none of which children are capable in the proper sense of the term regeneration." Dr. C. P. Krauth, (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 565,) in referring to the above statements says: "The charge against our Church as teaching "baptismal regeneration," as those who make the charge define it, is, as we have seen, utterly ungrounded. It is not true in its general state-

ment nor in its details; it is utterly without warrant in the whole or in a single particular." And this denial is reiterated by Dr. C. F. Schaeffer and Prof. D. Worley in their discussion of the subject contained in the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*. Thiers maintains that the words spoken in Titus 3 : 5, 6, "cannot hold good of every Baptism of every child, and that while *full* regeneration cannot be predicated of Infant Baptism, a living principle, and a commencement tending to that full regeneration, it does involve in spite of all contradiction and confusion of opinion." And he agrees with Hoffman, "that only in Infant Baptism, the nature of Baptism is exhibited in its purity and integrity, as it is the first receiving of the gift of grace unto a new life, while an adult must necessarily bring to it something of the old, in-rooted, personal character which affects, although it may be in a very small degree, the reception of the grace." And this opinion receives additional force from the fact, that the Apostles and their adult converts, as believers, were regenerated by the Spirit through the word as a spiritual seed and not through Baptism, and hence they and all others like them, as Gerhard says, "have no need of regeneration through Baptism, but to them Baptism is a confirmation and sealing of regeneration," and the passages referring to Baptism and the new birth are accordingly clothed with special signification when applied to Infant Baptism.

The doctrine of baptismal grace held by the Confessors, involving as it does the moral development and destiny of every baptized child, is not divested of all difficulties. But to those who admit the conclusiveness of the argument for Infant Baptism, and the specific office of Baptism, as the divinely appointed means of sealing the remission of sins and of conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost, as expressly taught by Christ, Peter, Paul and Luke, and illustrated by Apostolic practice, these difficulties will by no means appear insuperable. If Baptism be a *means of grace*, and there be but *one* Baptism, it must, when administered to children, be the medium of offering and conferring grace upon them. And if Baptism was designed to give assurance of justifica-

tion and impart the Spirit of regeneration, it must, unless it cease to be Baptism, perform its scriptural office when administered to children. In other words, Infant Baptism *must be* Baptism, and *not* some other ordinance. As those who hold the doctrine of human depravity, readily believe that God through Infant Baptism cancels the penal consequences of original sin, the remaining difficulty will be, to believe that God has made special provision for bestowing upon children the Holy Spirit, to aid them in resisting the sin-enticing power of their depraved natures. And can this prove a stumbling block to faith? We trow not.

Dr. Alexander says: "It is an interesting question, whether now there are any persons sanctified from the womb? If the communication of grace ever took place at so early a period, there is no reason why it should not now sometimes occur? * * As we believe that infants may be the subjects of regeneration, and cannot be saved without it, why may it not be the fact that some who are regenerated live to mature age?" If these questions be prompted from the Calvinistic standpoint of the particularity of grace, they are easily answered from the Lutheran standpoint of the universality of grace. No good reason can be given, why grace cannot be imparted in *some* cases at so early a period, but many reasons can be given why such grace may be imparted in all cases meeting the scriptural requirements through holy Baptism.

To the prophet Jeremiah it was said: "Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee." David declares that "the Lord was his God from his mother's womb," and that he made him to "hope from his mother's breasts." The angel Gabriel declared, that John the Baptist should "be filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb." These passages prove that children may become the subjects of divine grace and receive the Holy Spirit from birth, that he must have some way of influencing them; that by such influence they are "sanctified" and become the children of God, and that adequate reasons existed for such special manifestations of grace to children in both dispensations. These de-

clarations ought to remove the difficulty of those who think that infants are incapable of being brought under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and who, through their chronological and metaphysical speculations, propose to render God the important service of instructing him in regard to the capacities of children, and the operations of the Spirit, and of guarding him against a work of supererogation in dispensing his grace to them through Baptism prematurely. If Enoch and Elijah were bodily translated to heaven, and Lazarus and Christ raised from the dead, to illustrate the universality of the doctrine of immortality and the resurrection, why may not the sanctification of Jeremiah and John from the womb illustrate the universality of the doctrine of baptismal grace conferred upon children by the Holy Spirit through Infant Baptism?

The early piety of children has also an important bearing on this subject. Samuel feared the Lord from his earliest years. Timothy knew the Scriptures and was made wise unto salvation from childhood. Jesus declares that the "little ones believe in him." Dr. Bushnell refers to the case of Baxter, who became pious so young, that he could not remember any period when he did not love and trust in Jesus, and Dr. Alexander states that such cases have often occurred. President Edwards mentions the case of Phoebe Bartlett, and other manifestations of the Spirit's work in the conversion of very young children in his day, and the examples of early piety in the family and the Sunday-schools in our day, may be counted by thousands. Now Luther, in the *Larger Catechism*, and Melancthon in the *Apology*, state that God gave the Holy Ghost to many who were baptized in their infancy, both in the past and at the present time, and regard it not only as an argument in favor of Infant Baptism, but also of the truth of the doctrine of baptismal grace.

Every child has an animal and a rational nature, whose respective developments commence from birth. The motive power of the animal nature is exerted through appetite, that of the rational nature through conscience. Now, as the

world and Satan may influence the animal nature to do evil, the Holy Ghost is provided to influence the rational nature to do good. Adequate provision is thus made to counteract the development of depravity, and to secure the development of piety. But if baptismal grace be denied to children, then will the flesh, the world and the devil have free course, and childhood be left helpless and exposed to their corrupting influences, without any supernatural assistance during the formative period of life, in determining its course and in forming its character. And if this be true, then must the declaration, that "where sin abounded" through Adam, "grace did much more abound" through Christ, be regarded rather as a rhetorical flourish than as a veritable fact, and such deficiency stand out as a glaring and unaccountable inconsistency in the economy of grace and redemption. Every child has constitutionally a disposition to love and trust its parents. This disposition manifests itself very early, and becomes the ground of piety, that is of obedience towards its parents, prompted by faith and love. Now, as it is the work of the Holy Spirit to shed abroad the love of God in the heart, why *may* he not, by a superinduction of divine grace, so dispose the heart of a child, that its constitutional capacity for piety towards its parents may become also a gracious capacity for piety towards God? And as it is the work of the Holy Spirit to take the things of Christ and show them to the soul, the child, as it is made acquainted with Christ, will be able spiritually to discern him, and its gracious capacity to love, trust, and obey him will become manifest, and constitute Christian piety. And in this manner, the Spirit will work faith, as well as to will and to do in the mind and heart of a child, in his own time and in his own way. And that such manifestations of baptismal grace are not only possible but actual, the history of Christian nurture in the churches holding it abundantly proves.

The apprehension, that the doctrine of baptismal grace would prove practically detrimental to experimental piety, is based upon misapprehension. The doctrines concerning faith, repentance, conversion, regeneration and sanctification, when

apprehended and received, become the source of religious experience and practical piety. But no uninspired men ever lived who understood and preached these doctrines more clearly and effectively than Luther and the Reformers, Spener and the Pietists, Muhlenberg and the fathers of the American Lutheran Church. The modern spiritualistic reformers, who charge them with promoting formalism and self-righteousness, and who claim a monopoly of experimental piety, would do well to sit at their feet as learners, and from their writings and example correct their fanatical notions of religious experience, as well as mend their inconsistent lives. The Confessors held the doctrine of baptismal grace, and through the consistent use of it, became the authors of the Reformation; the Pietists, the promoters of the revival of true Lutheranism; and the Halleian Fathers, the founders of the Lutheran Church in America.

The tendency to naturalism and legalism is inherent in human nature, and not a necessary outgrowth of the doctrine of baptismal grace. It threatened, at times, almost a total apostasy during the Mosaic economy, led the Jews to crucify Christ, deluded even some of the converts of the apostles, leavened the Romish Church, and inoculated the Lutheran in the seventeenth, the Episcopal in the eighteenth, and the Congregational in the nineteenth century, and the instruments chosen of God to reform them, through a revival of experimental piety, were, in almost all cases, except that of Edwards, believers in baptismal grace.

Two general systems of religious effort for the promotion of experimental piety have been prevalent in the Christian Church. The one may be called the system of religious training, involving baptismal grace, infant membership, and Christian nurture in the family, the school and the Church. While its advocates make a faithful use of the ordinary means of grace, they regard it as not only allowable, but also in accordance with scriptural precedent, to make special efforts to lead the impenitent to Christ and edify believers, at such times as the religious interests of the Church and the indications of providence call for them. The other system

may be called that of extraordinary, periodical efforts. Its advocates reject baptismal grace, lay comparatively little stress on Christian nurture, undervalue the ordinary means of grace, and rely mainly on special periodical efforts for the conversion of children and adults. But the large proportion of self-deceptions and spurious experiences, together with the multitude of backsliders and the instability of the piety promoted thereby, have induced many of its abettors to modify it, by introducing some of the features of the training system of God, and thus guard against its injurious results. Tested by its fruits, the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal grace, when faithfully preached and consistently developed, will bear favorable comparison with the modern system of periodical efforts, or with any other system of doctrine and usage ever employed for the promotion of experimental religion and the development of true piety.

If the arguments by which the Confessors endeavored to prove the doctrine of baptismal grace be deemed inconclusive, those who reject it will be constrained either to originate a new or to adopt an old theory. As they will hardly venture to engage in invention, they must content themselves with making a selection. They are not likely to make choice of the one-sided, spiritualistic theory of the Quakers, who dispense with Baptism altogether; nor that of the Anabaptists, who reject Infant Baptism; nor that of the Romanists, who invest it with a magical influence; nor that of the Campbellites, who attribute its justifying and regenerating power to its mode, (immersion); nor to that of the Calvinists, who maintain that Baptism is applied to the children of believing parents, as the sign of a regeneration already accomplished, according to the purpose and election of God. This leaves them nothing but the Puritan theory as the object of their choice.

The modern Puritan theory was recently set forth in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* in these words: "In the economy of grace, prayer for the salvation of men puts them in the way of receiving more abundant ministrations of the Spirit. Infant Baptism is on the part of parents and the Church, a con-

fession, a prayer, a pledge and a hope embodied in one sacrament. It is a confession of the universal reign of sin, except where grace abounds; a prayer for the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit; a pledge of faithfulness of Christian nurture; and a monument of the hope that the prayer will be answered, and that through the divine blessing, the nurture will accomplish its designed results. As being the most objective and public expression of this faith that can be made on the part of the parent and the Church, God, on his part, binds himself, in this act more than in any other, to fulfil his promise, and to bestow peculiar blessings on the children thus consecrated to him." This theory while it still calls Baptism a sacrament, really divests it of its sacramental character, and substitutes prayer in its stead. Prayer is the *means* of securing for others the ministrations of the Spirit. According to the Scriptures, however, prayer is a privilege, to be improved by the individual believer, to whom the promise of the Spirit is given, and which he may offer constantly, but it is not like Baptism a formal rite through which God confers the Holy Spirit upon others. It contradicts itself. It first makes prayer the *means* of conferring the Spirit, but afterwards maintains that God through Baptism, in an especial manner binds himself to fulfil his promise and bestow peculiar blessings upon baptized children, meaning, of course, the Holy Spirit. It confounds Christian nurture and baptismal grace. Prayer is, indeed, offered in the administration of Baptism, but it belongs to and is an important part of Christian nurture, and not a substitute for Baptism. Every thing is made to depend on nurture, and nothing upon grace. So that without nurture, Baptism does not and will not avail anything for the child. But according to the Scriptures, Baptism is a means of grace, supplying the conditions upon which the possibility and success of Christian nurture depend. While this theory formally initiates the children into the Church, it really leaves them in the world; and hence it is declared that "it leads to a confusion of thought, and a perversion of the rite (Baptism), to call baptized children church members, until they give some posi-

tive sign of regeneration, and make a public profession of Christ."

This theory not only ignores the initiatory character of Infant Baptism, but by denying that it is a means of grace, it involves an erroneous theory of Christian nurture, and leads to the most lamentable results. Dr. Bushnell describes it in his work on "Christian Nurture" as follows: "It is the prevalence of false views on this subject (Christian nurture) which creates so great difficulty in sustaining Infant Baptism in our churches. If children are to grow up in sin, to be converted when they come to the age of maturity, if this is the only aim and expectation of family nurture, there really is no meaning or dignity whatever in the rite (Baptism). They are even baptized into sin, and every propriety of the rite as a seal of faith is violated. The aim, effort and expectation should be, not as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years. * * It would certainly be very singular, if Christ Jesus in a scheme of mercy for the world had found no place for infants and little children—more singular still, if he had given them the place of adults; and worse than singular, if he had appointed them to years of sin as the necessary preparation for his mercy."

"And why should it be thought incredible, that there should be some really good principle awakened in the mind of a child? For this is all that is implied in a Christian state. The Christian is one who has simply *begun* to love what is good for its own sake; and why should it be thought impossible for a child to have this love begotten in him? Take any scheme of depravity you please, there is yet nothing in it to forbid the possibility, that a child should be led, in his first moral act, to cleave unto what is good and right, any more than in the first of his twentieth year. He is in that case, only a child converted to good, leading a mixed life as all Christians do. The good in him goes into combat with the

evil, and holds a qualified sovereignty. And why may not this internal conflict of goodness cover the whole life from its dawn, as well as any part of it? And what more appropriate to the doctrine of spiritual influence itself, than to believe that, as the Spirit of Jehovah fills all the worlds of matter, and holds a presence of power and government in all its objects, so all human souls, the infantile as well as the adult, have a mixture of the Spirit, appropriate to their age and their wants? What opinion is more essentially monstrous, in fact, than that which regards the Holy Spirit as having no agency in the immature souls of children, who are growing up helpless and unconscious, into the perils of time?"

While Dr. Bushnell rejects the Romish error of Baptismal Regeneration, he declares that the Puritan theory and practice concerning Infant Baptism, involve an error scarcely less injurious. He does not, indeed, introduce the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal grace, but that very grace for which he pleads, and through the influence of which children may be trained to grow up Christians, is precisely the grace which the Confessors taught that Infant Baptism offers and secures.

When the Puritan and the Lutheran theories of Infant Baptism are tested by the Scriptures, the contrast between them becomes still more striking. Admit that through Baptism God confers the Holy Spirit upon children, and every passage pertaining to the subject can be readily explained, according to the true laws of interpretation. Deny this, and transform Baptism into a naked sign of grace, and parental pledge of Christian nurture, and the baptismal passages cannot be made to accord with such a theory, without doing violence to the rules of sound exegesis. Children, offered to God in the name of Christ, are said to receive the kingdom of God, but they are, nevertheless, left without grace, to choose the kingdom of Satan—they are recognized as members of the Church, which is made up of the saved, but they belong to the world, which embraces the lost—they are baptized into the communion of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but, with original sin untouched by grace, they remain in fellowship with the devil and his angels.

We conclude our lecture, with the following summary of the Lutheran doctrine of Baptism as set forth by the Confessors. Baptism is a religious ordinance, instituted by Jesus Christ. Its constituent elements are water and the word of God. Its administration consists in the application of water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, by an authorized minister of the gospel, either by sprinkling, pouring or immersion. Its subjects are adult believers and their children. Its validity is based upon its divine institution and observance according to the command of God, and not upon either the character of the administrator, the mode of applying the water, or the faith of the recipient. It is a sacrament or "visible word," an efficacious sign and seal of the promise of God, a sure testimony of his will toward us, which becomes efficacious, not *ex opere operato*, but through faith, apprehending the truths signified, and relying upon the promise made by it. It is a means of grace, through which God offers his grace and confers the Holy Spirit, who excites and confirms faith, in those who use it aright, whereby they obtain the remission of sins, are born again, released from condemnation and eternal death, and are received and remain in God's favor, so long as they continue in a state of faith and bring forth good works; but to them who are destitute of faith it remains a fruitless sign and imparts no blessing; while those who misimprove their Baptism by a course of wilful sin and wicked works, receive the grace of God in vain, grieve and lose the Holy Spirit, and fall into a state of condemnation, from which they cannot be recovered, except by a true conversion, involving a renewal of the understanding, will and heart. Baptism ought also to be administered to children, who, through such Baptism, are offered to God, become acceptable to him, and are received into his favor. It imposes the duty of Christian nurture upon parents and the Church, and finds its complement in Confirmation. It is ordinarily necessary, as a divinely appointed ordinance, but not absolutely essential to salvation.

ARTICLE IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY AS TAUGHT BY THE
DOGMATICIANS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.

There has been much discussion in our Church in this country concerning the doctrine of the ministry; yet to most minds the question does not seem to have been settled. The points at issue are of too great importance to be passed by with utter indifference. The word of God insists upon a proper understanding of the subject, 1 Cor. 4 : 1; 1 Thess. 2 : 13; Luke 10 : 16; Acts 17 : 11. Extreme views concerning it either end in the corruptions of Romanism, or overthrow and destroy the Church as a divinely-appointed organism. More than ordinary interest also is connected with the question, as bearing upon the whole future of our Lutheran church in America. Her successful development is conditioned upon her organization in accordance with Scriptural principles; and of these Scriptural principles none are more fundamental to proper organization than the doctrine of the Ministry. If the present period of experiments is ever to give place to one in which the entire church shall harmoniously co-operate in the great work before us, this question is one of the very first that we must face.

WHY THE TESTIMONY OF OUR DOGMATICIANS SHOULD BE REGARDED.

The clear determination as to the doctrine taught in the word of God, and the manner in which our Lutheran church has understood that doctrine, is, therefore, an end greatly to be desired. Of those who have sought to attain this end, none deserve more consideration for their candor, their vast learning, their habits of thorough investigation, and their sincere desire to reach the truth, than the great dogmaticians of the Lutheran church. They are not infallible; but

among fallible men, we claim for their judgment a very high place. Before Chemnitz, the earliest of them, had written his *Examen*, the whole subject had already entered into numerous controversies of the Lutherans against the Papists on the one side, and the Anabaptists on the other. The whole field of dispute therefore was in view; and all statements were guarded with such care as to prevent any misunderstanding that might perhaps interpret them as favoring an opposite extreme. In this respect, they have the advantage of Luther whose language is not guarded with the same care. Those who neglect the two important rules of interpretation: "1. Consider the design with which each particular definition was framed. 2. If there have been controversies concerning the definition, their consideration will bring light,"* cannot help but reach the conclusion: "All who have diligently studied Luther's books know that it is difficult to explain clearly what that great man thought concerning every subject."† But in our dogmaticians, there is little difficulty to determine from the context itself precisely what was intended, as they have framed their whole treatment of the subject with reference to all the controversies concerning it that had arisen.

THE MINISTRY NOT A HIERARCHICAL ORDER.

Against the Romish theory that ministers are priests to the exclusion of other believers, our church has always protested. She recognizes under the New Testament only two priest-hoods, one the high-priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Heb. 4 : 14, and the other the universal priesthood of believers, 1 Pet. 2 : 5, 9; Rev. 1 : 6. She emphatically denies the existence under the New Testament of any hierarchical order, like that of the Levitical priesthood under the Old Testament, Apology xiii. 7, 10.

Yet she has sometimes applied the term priest to her ministers, *e. g.*, Aug. Conf. Art. xxiii. 3, 9; xxiv. 13, Apology xiii. 9, etc., using it in a wide and general sense, and with a

*Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici*, p. 16.

†Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus Ecc. Luth.*, p. 1.

distinct protest against the abuse of the term by the Papists. Apology xiii. 11. The derivation of the word rendering it more nearly allied to the idea of *πρεσβύτερος* than of *ιερεύς*, and its almost inseparable connection in the minds of the people, with many of the functions pertaining to the office of the ministry, apart from any taint of sacerdotalism, caused it to be retained in this general sense until it could be abolished without confusion. It is important to bear in mind the qualifications by which our Church-writers guard the use of this term.

CHEMNITZ *Examen Con. Tri.* (*De Sacramento Ordinis*, Preuss 475): "In New Testament Scripture, the name of priest and priesthood is never given the New Testament ministry. The custom of calling the ministry a priesthood and ministers priests grew from the practice of church writers. * * If, therefore, the Papists only wished that in the New Testament there should be an outward priesthood, *i. e.*, an outward ministry of the word and sacraments, as we have just explained, there would be no controversy, neither would there be any trouble excited as to the name priesthood, provided only those things which are true and necessary were left in security."

GERHARD, *Loci Theologici* (*De Min. Ecc.* §15): "The inference from Scripture is that the word priest is received in diverse ways. In the first place *properly* for a person who presents an outward bodily sacrifice to God; in this signification it is received whenever used either concerning the Levites or Christ. Secondly, *figuratively* for spiritual priests offering spiritual victims to God; in this sense and respect, all the truly pious are said to be priests. * * Although Holy Scripture nowhere particularly mentions ministers of the Church as priests, yet we grant that in a true sense that word can be applied specifically to ministers of the Church, and that it has been so ascribed by old writers. * * But the name priest cannot be ascribed in a true sense to ministers, as though they still present to God any sacrifice that is outward, and a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term, since we nowhere read that they have received such a

command to offer sacrifice, as in the New Testament there is only one such priest, viz. Christ, Heb. 5 : 6 ; 7 : 3 ; 9 : 15, etc."

§16: "This type of the Levitical priesthood has already been completed in Christ, the only priest of the New Testament, for offering himself on the altar of the cross, "by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10 : 14; and therefore *in no way is the fulfilment of this type to be sought in the ministers of the New Testament, but in Christ alone.*"

THE MINISTRY NOT DEPENDENT UPON ANY OUTWARD SUCCESSION.

The very idea of a hierarchy is that of the transmission of spiritual functions through an outward succession. This is the theory of the Romish, Greek and Anglican churches. Mœhler, the greatest of modern Romish theologians thus defines it: "The visibility and stability of the Church, require an ecclesiastical ordination originating with Christ, the fountain-head, and perpetuated in uninterrupted succession; so that as the apostles were sent forth by the Saviour, they in their turn, instituted bishops, and these appointed their successors, and so on down to our own days. By this episcopal succession, beginning from our Saviour, and continued on without interruption, we can especially recognize, as by an outward mark, which is the true church founded by him."² Perceval an approved Anglican authority says: "The church of England holds that the commission and authority for ministering in the name of God has been transmitted from the Apostles, by what is called episcopal succession; that is to say, that the Apostles left the power which they had received from Christ to govern the churches, and to preach the gospel, and to administer the sacraments, and to ordain other clergy to assist in all these duties, in the hands of a certain class of chief pastors (to whom in very early times the term *bishop* was appropriated); that this power and commission has been handed down in the Church from their time till now, by Bishops ordaining Bishops; and that none who have not re-

²Mœhler's *Symbolism*, Eng. Trans. p. 299.

ceived episcopal ordination, are lawful ministers of the Church, or warranted to perform any acts in the name and with the authority of God."*

We cannot help but acknowledge that there is a fascination about the idea of an outward succession, and that the thought, which involuntarily presents itself on witnessing an ordination, of the long line of hands reaching backward from those on the head of the candidate, is a very pleasing one. So too is the outward succession of a long line of pious ancestors, yet that the establishment of the claim to mere outward succession, carries with it no weight, the New Testament repeatedly teaches, Mat. 3 : 9 ; John 8 : 37—39 ; Rom. 4 : 12, 13, 16. The necessity of an outward succession is an Old Testament idea : the New Testament requirement is that of an inward succession, *i. e.* a succession of faith and doctrine, Rom. 4 : 16 ; Gal. 1 : 8. Hence the distinct statement of the Augsburg Confession, Art. VII, that the only marks of the church are the pure preaching of the gospel, and the right administration of the sacraments, and its ignoring of an outward succession of ministers as any test whatever of the true church.

CHEMNITZ L. T. (iii. p. 132): "For as there will always be a church, so there will always be pure teachers. But these promises are not bound to any certain persons, to any certain succession, or to any certain place. For Paul says to the elders of Ephesus, Acts 20 : 30," etc. Chemnitz' argument in support of this position is very full, and altogether unanswerable. See his *Locus De Ecclesia*, pp. 129—133.

GERHARD, *Loci Theologici* (*De Ecclesia*, Sectio V. § 190): "The succession of places and persons is an outward and mutable accident, nor is it of any importance without a succession of doctrine. * * Those are to be regarded true successors of the Apostles who sincerely embrace the doctrine and faith of the Apostles as contained in their writings, even though they have not that outward and local succession. * * As the Apostles appealed from the local and outward succe-

*Perceval on Apostolical Succession, p. 7.

sion, in which Caiaphas could have boasted, to a doctrinal and inner succession, when they publicly protested that they taught "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," and did not seek ordination of Caiaphas: so also to-day in the evangelical churches, we justly appeal from a local and personal succession, to a doctrinal succession."

Ib. (*De Ministerio Ecclesiastico*, Sectio IX. § 129,) "We must distinguish between a personal and doctrinal succession. The latter succession alone is necessary and sufficient to a lawful call." So also QUENSTEDT, *Theo-Did-Pol*, Part IV: p. 410.

THE MINISTRY NOT IDENTICAL WITH THE SPIRITUAL PRIESTHOOD.

But the doctrinal succession whilst essential to the ministry is not the only requisite. Not every one who embraces the pure word of God, thereby attains the rights of a christian minister. As extremes often meet, so the Romish and Anabaptist theories unite in confounding the ministry with the priesthood; the former by establishing a hierarchical order of ministers who are regarded as the only priests, and the latter by asserting that the whole community of spiritual priests are ministers. Thus the Anabaptists, at the period of the Reformation, insisted from 1 Pet. 2: 5, 9; Rev. 1: 6, that all believers have the right to exercise the public ministry of the word, and that no farther call to the office was necessary. This opinion the Augsburg Confession in Art. XIV. plainly condemns. But the kindred idea that the spiritual priesthood confers upon every individual believer the right to exercise the ministry, yet that for the sake of good order this right should not be assumed by all, but only by a limited number to whom the rest would delegate these rights, has caused some confusion in the discussion of this subject. Nothing can be clearer than the antagonism of our great Lutheran divines to this position, nor anything more convincing than their arguments against it.

CHEMNITZ, *Examen Conc. Trid.* (Locus, *De Sacramento Ordinis*): "All Christians are indeed priests, 1 Pet. 2., Rev. 1.

because they offer spiritual sacrifices to God. Each one also at his own home, both can and should teach the word of God, Deut. 6., 1 Cor. 14. Nevertheless it is not every christian who should take upon himself the public ministry of the Word and Sacraments. For not all are apostles, not all teachers, 1 Cor. 12, but those only who by a peculiar and lawful call, have been separated by God to this ministry, Acts 13, Jer. 23, Rom. 10."

CHEMNITZ, *Loci, Theologici* (Locus, *De Ecclesia*, Cap. iv. p. 119): "They also object: But Christ has made all believers priests, Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10; 1 Pet. 2: 9: and the office of priests among other things is to teach the church, Lev. 10: 10, 11, Mal. 2: 7. I reply: Paul, 1 Cor. 12: 7, 8, 9, and likewise v, 29 expressly writes, that God does not give all the gift of explaining the Scriptures, but that for the advantage and edification of the church, he distributes in different ways the gifts of His Spirit: and in Eph. 4: 11, that he gives some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers for the work of the ministry. Peter also explains his own words, that all Christians are priests: not that all should promiscuously, without a peculiar call, discharge the duties of the ministry, but that they should offer the spiritual sacrifices which are described, Rom. 12: 1, 'that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God which is your reasonable service,' and Heb. 13: 15, 16, 'By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.'"

On the other hand, they insist: 'Peter says that all believers are priests to show forth the praises of God, 1 Pet. 2: 9, and fathers of families have the general command to instruct the members of their households, Deut. 6: 20, 1 Cor. 14: 35,' I reply: 'To all Christians indeed, the general call to speak with each other concerning the word of God, Eph. 5: 19, and to comfort each other with the word, 1 Thess. 4: 18, and to confess the gospel, Rom. 10: 9, is common; and upon fathers of families, this is enjoined by a special

command. But to administer those things which belong to the public ministry of the word and sacraments, is not commanded to all Christians in general; as those two passages, 1 Cor. 12, and Eph. 4, above cited clearly show. Nor is the general call which all believers receive in Baptism, sufficient for the ministry, but a peculiar call is required, as has been already shown, James 3 : 1. But it is of advantage to consider why it makes so much importance that the minister of the church should have a lawful call. For we must not think that this happens from any human institution, *or only for the sake of order* : but the reasons are of the greatest importance, the consideration of which teaches us many things."

GERHARD (*Loci Theologici*, Locus xxiii., Cotta xii. 2, 65, Preuss vi. 43) in reply to the arguments of the Anabaptists, Photinians and others who cited 1 Pet. 2 : 9; Rev. 1 : 6; 5 : 9, 10, against the necessity of a call to the ministry: "They are called spiritual priests, not with respect to ecclesiastical office, * * but with respect to the spiritual sacrifices which are to be offered to God, just as Peter himself explains it in v. 5, "ye are a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," such as prayer, Ps. 141 : 2; Rev. 5 : 8; 8 : 4; giving of thanks, Heb. 13 : 5, alms for the poor, Phil. 4 : 18; Heb. 13 : 16, mortification of the old man, Rom. 12 : 1, martyrdom endured for Christ's sake, Phil. 2 : 17; 2 Tim. 4 : 6. Such sacrifices can be offered by all the pious as by spiritual priests. * * Although indeed the preaching of the gospel belongs also to spiritual sacrifices, Mal. 1 : 11; Rom. 15 : 16, yet from the appellation of spiritual priests ascribed to all the pious *it cannot be inferred that to all belongs this spiritual sacrifice, namely the preaching of the gospel in the public congregation of the Church*, inasmuch as the reason for the name is derived from the spiritual sacrifices which all can offer, but not from that which is in no way common to all. This is clearly inferred from the words of the apostle, 1 Cor. 12 : 20, "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?" All believers are spiritual priests, and yet all are not on this account teachers or prophets, since not all are instructed in the gift of prophecy, or called

to the ministry of the Church, Eph. 4 : 11. Therefore, as not all are prophets or apostles, so also not all are pastors and teachers.

Nor is there any force in the objection, that Peter adds that the pious are a royal priesthood to show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into his marvelous light; for we must distinguish between (a) the *general* command and call, which all the pious receive at their reception of Christianity, and by which it is required of them to proclaim the praises of God, to repay Him by whom they have been called to the fellowship of the Church, by words and deeds to confess Him, privately to instruct their own families in true piety, Deut. 6 : 26, to be careful that the word of God dwell in them richly in all wisdom, and that they teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, Eph. 5 : 19; Col. 3 : 16, and that they comfort each other by the word of God, 1 Thess. 4 : 18, etc., and (b) the *special* call by which it is demanded that the ministry of the word and sacraments be administered, in the public assembly of the Church according to the public consent of the Church, by certain persons fit for it; and that this call is not common to all Christians is evident from 1 Cor. 12 : 29; Eph. 4 : 11; James 3 : 1.

To this special call belongs the administering of the sacraments, as is inferred from 1 Cor. 4 : 1. Now the mutual administering of the sacraments is nowhere either commanded or permitted all believers. Therefore, the public ministry of the word also does not pertain to all."

HOLLAZ, *Examen Theologicum (De Ministerio Ecclesiastico)* in opposition to the same argument of the Anabaptists and Photinians: "Whoever are priests before God, can teach and instruct others without a peculiar call (for to teach others is an office of priests). All Christians are priests before God. Therefore —. We reply: 1. By making a distinction between priests so called by reason of their ecclesiastical office; and by reason of spiritual sacrifices. All Christians are priests by reason of spiritual sacrifices, such as prayers, praises, alms,

mortification of the body; but not all are priests by reason of the public ecclesiastical office. For to women also belongs the priesthood with respect to spiritual sacrifices; but not by reason of the ecclesiastical office, 1 Tim. 2 : 12. 2. Christians are called not only priests, but also kings before God. If, therefore, even when there is no case of necessity, Christians are permitted, on account of their spiritual priesthood, to perform acts belonging to the ecclesiastical priesthood, it follows that the same persons, on account of their spiritual kingship, can equally, even when there is no necessity, perform acts pertaining to a political kingdom; from which execrable anarchy would result."

A PRIVATE CHRISTIAN, NOTWITHSTANDING HIS SPIRITUAL PRIESTHOOD, DARE NOT, WITHOUT A CALL TO THE OFFICE, EXERCISE ANY OF THE SPECIAL DUTIES PERTAINING TO THE MINISTRY, EXCEPT IN CASES OF EXTREME NECESSITY.

This is included in the discussion of the preceding point; yet it is of such importance that it requires distinct reference. The language of the Augsburg Confession, Art. xiv., is very emphatic: "They teach that *no man should publicly teach in the Church, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called.*"

CHEMNITZ, *L. T. (De Ecclesia, iii. 119)*: "It is certain from the word of God, that *in the Church no one ought to be heard, who has not been lawfully called.* For Paul distinctly says, Rom. 10 : 15, that they cannot preach (viz. by right, even though they may actually attempt it) who have not been sent. And in Jer. 23 : 21, God complains: "I have not sent these prophets; yet they ran." Indeed the churches ought not and cannot with any profit hear those who have not testimonies of a lawful call. For the words of Paul, Rom. 10 : 14, are manifestly: How can they hear so as to receive from hearing that faith which justifies and saves, if they have not a teacher who has been sent. Jer. 27 : 14, 15; Heb. 5 : 5. Therefore the Anabaptists, whom Luther calls deceitful sneaks, who enter houses and confuse men in faith, are justly censured and rejected. For verily they say that if any one

understand the doctrine of the gospel, whether he be a shoemaker, or a hoer, or a blacksmith, he ought to teach and preach."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Ecc.*, cap. iii., sec. 1), is so full that it is difficult to make a selection. The discussion occupies fifteen double-column, fine type, large quarto pages. Among other things he says: "These words of the Confession are opposed: 1. *To the calumnies of the Papists* who made the charge that in our churches all things were done in confusion and without order, and *that the power to teach was granted by us to every one in the church.* * * 2. *To the confusion of the Anabaptists*, who without a call take upon themselves the parts of the ministry of the Church, and allow all promiscuously the office of teaching, introducing in this way barbarous disorder into the Church." * * "We show the necessity of the call: 1. By the express testimonies of Scripture. 2. By approved examples which comprise the practice of the entire Church of the Old and of the New Testament. 3. By reasons founded upon Scripture." Under the first head, each of the following passages is examined at length, Jer. 23 : 21; 27 : 9, 14, 15; John 3 : 27; Rom. 10 : 15; Heb. 5 : 4, 5. "The second class of arguments contains approved examples, in reference to which we lay down the general rule that *no one either in the Old Testament or the New, has rightly administered the public office of teaching in the Church unless divinely called to it*, nor do we think that an example to the contrary can be produced." Of the third class, we select the following: "*He who without a call takes upon himself the public office of teaching in the Church*, invades the province of another; is not an ambassador and minister of God, but a thief and a robber, since he does not enter by the door, nor a minister of the Church, since he has not been called by it; disturbs the order appointed by God; introduces confusion of which God is not the author, 1 Cor. 14 : 33; violates the example of Christ, the prophets and apostles, none of whom preached unless first sent and called; makes the dignity of this most revered office vile; deprives himself of needed consolation, and soon brings upon himself an unhappy end." In answering the counter

arguments of the Anabaptists, he notices 1 Cor. 14 : 29, 30 : "It is certain that the apostle does not speak there concerning a promiscuous assembly of the pious (for this is clearly inferred from chapter 12 : 29 : "Are all prophets?"); but concerning a certain order among the pious, although opinions vary as to what it was. Most of our theologians understand by the name of prophets, the ordinary teachers of the Church, endowed with the gift of prophecy, *i. e.*, of interpreting Scripture. From Acts 13 : 15, it can be inferred that formerly in the primitive Church, such a mode of teaching was customary that after the singing of hymns some passage of Scripture would be read, and then one of the teachers of the Church would rise to explain the passage that had been read, and to derive doctrine from it. When he would finish speaking, another likewise skilled in the gift of prophecy or of interpreting Scripture would rise, so that there would be not only one, but two or even three preachers who spoke in turn. They think that the apostle in these words has reference to such a custom; * * but in no way can it be inferred from this, that to teach publicly in the church without any call ought to be lawful, since the apostle immediately afterwards adds, v. 33 : 'God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.'"

Yet, in cases of extreme necessity, the word may be preached, or Baptism administered without a call. Thus the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles says : "In case of necessity, a mere layman may absolve another, and become his pastor; as St. Augustine relates that two Christians were in a ship together, the one baptized the other, and afterwards was absolved by him."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Ecc.* §74): "In a case of extreme necessity, when a man must either depart without baptism, or baptism must be administered by a private person, it is better that baptism be administered by the private person, than that the man should depart without baptism; nevertheless the administration of baptism ordinarily belongs to the ministers of the Church."

HOLLAZ, *Examen Theologicum*, (*De Min. Ecc.* q. viii., ob. ii.):

"In the collecting and establishing of a church, where there are not those present who having been ordinarily called, may teach, nor any at hand to give a call, in this extreme case of necessity, where the glory of God and the salvation of our neighbors are alone to be regarded, we willingly grant that any Christian is bound to instil the catechetical milk of righteousness to those unskilled in speech."

Ib. (*De Baptismo*, q. iv.): "Extraordinarily and in case of necessity, any pious Christian, whether male or female, acquainted with sacred rites, can administer baptism."

Ib. (*De Eucharistia*, q. iv.): "Not even in case of necessity, is the administration of the Holy Supper to be committed to a layman or private Christian; because there is a distinction in this respect between baptism, which is a sacrament of initiation, and the eucharist, which is a sacrament of confirmation. Concerning the necessity of Baptism Christ bears witness, John 3 : 5. But the use of the Holy Supper has not been made of equal necessity; and therefore when there can be no resource to the ordinary ministry, then the remark of Augustine is in place: 'Believe and thou hast eaten.'"

GERHARD, (Ib. §74): "Some limit the necessity of the call in such a manner as to concede that one not called can teach: 1. When a Christian is with men ignorant of the Christian faith; for then every one is bound to seek and promote the glory of God to his utmost ability. 2. In a church, the church order of which has not as yet been fully organized: for since the call of teachers is part of the order, when the former is deficient, the latter cannot be so strictly observed. 3. When the ordinary teachers degenerate into wolves, and altogether neglect their duty." See Hunnius, "Vindication of Luth. Ministry against the Papists."

WHAT IS THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY?

The ministry we have thus found to be neither an order transmitted by outward succession, nor an office belonging to all Christians, which they can use or delegate as they see fit, but that it rests upon a divine call. Without this call, no one is permitted to assume to himself the position of an am-

bassador of God; nor dare Christian people recognize him as such, or allow him, without extreme necessity, to discharge any of those duties which God has entrusted to the ministry. A clear answer to the question, "What is the call to the ministry," is, therefore, of the utmost importance. By confused ideas on the subject, we may either fail to respond to what is a true call, by waiting for evidences of a call not required by the holy word; or may press forward into the holy office, when we have no right there, mistaking our own fancy for the voice of God. Those who in obedience to a true call have entered the office, may deprive themselves of much comfort by failing to apprehend those promises, Is. 59 : 21; 2 Cor. 13 : 2; Luke 10 : 16; 2 Cor. 2 : 12; 1 Tim. 4 : 12; Is. 49 : 2; 51 : 16; Luke 1 : 16; 1 Tim. 4 : 16; 1 Cor. 15 : 58; 19 : 9, etc., which are so richly offered to rightly called ministers. If those to whom is committed the setting apart of ministers, are to discharge their duty conscientiously and in the fear of God, they must reach some definite conclusion regarding the teaching of God's word concerning this call. Nothing too can be more important for all true Christians, than some rule whereby to distinguish those whom they can regard as duly authorized to teach in public as ministers of Christ, from those who are not.

CHEMNITZ, *L. T.* (*De Ecclesia*, iii, p. 120); "The certainty of a divine call to the ministry is also profitable to this end, that the ministers may fulfill their office with greater diligence, faith and zeal, and be less easily deterred. This doctrine concerning the call also excites in hearers, true respect and obedience to the ministry."

THE IMMEDIATE CALL NO LONGER GIVEN.

The immediate call was a direct outward revelation from God to an individual, appointing him to the office. It was in most cases absolutely independent of any human agency. The call to the ministry no longer has this form; yet, in the discussion it is important to bear in mind the distinction between the two forms, in order to avoid a confusion of the

circumstances peculiar to the immediate call with those of the call as at present given.

CHEMNITZ, *L. T.* (ib. p. 121): "The immediate call is when one is called to the ministry not by men, nor through men, as ordinary means, but immediately by God himself, and through God himself. * * In an immediate call, God himself either appears or speaks immediately to those whom in this manner he calls. Thus without doubt the prophets and apostles were called. Thus God immediately calls Moses from the burning bush, Ex. 3 : 4. Thus the call of Aaron is immediately confirmed by God, Num. 17 : 8 ; whilst his rod buds. The call of Matthias also was immediate, Acts 1 : 26 ; as God revealed his will, through the casting of lots. So Paul, Gal. 1 : 1, describes his call, that it was 'not of men, neither by man.'

But if any one should ask, whether an immediate call is to be expected also in our time, I believe that we ought to reply : That whilst it is true that we ought not to be ready to prescribe anything to the will and infinite power of God, yet we have no command pertaining to us, to expect an immediate call ; neither have we any promise that God wishes at this time by an immediate call to send laborers into his harvest. But through the Apostles he has delivered and committed to the Church a certain form as to how he now desires to send and call ministers, namely through a mediate call. Nor is there any necessity now for an immediate call. For God wishes the ministry to be bound until the end of the world to that declaration of doctrine which was received from the Son of God, and immediately delivered to the Church by Apostles who were immediately called, Gal. 1 : 8 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 14 ; Heb. 1 : 1. Therefore no new doctrine whatever is to be received. Even though some should rise up, who would boast of an immediate call, and in addition would produce stupendous wonders, and would teach an entirely new and different doctrine from that of Christ and the Apostles, yet we ought not to believe them. For Christ predicted that antichrist would arise, who would produce such miracles, so that, if it were possible, even the elect would be deceived into error ; and

Paul testifies of the coming of the son of perdition "after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders," 2 Thess. 2 : 9.

The advantage of this distinction between the immediate and the mediate call must also be noted. * * For the prophets and apostles, inasmuch as they were called, have the witness of the Spirit and of miracles that they did not err in doctrine ; so that other ministers, in the church, might be obliged to derive their doctrine from the prophets and apostles, and prove it thence, or be accursed. Neither was their ministry restricted to a definite place, but they have the command to teach everywhere. But those who have not an immediate call cannot claim these two things for themselves, nor ought they to be allotted them."

GERHARD, *L. T. (De Min. Ecc. §79)*; "To those whom God calls immediately, without the aid and ministry of men, he either himself appears and converses immediately with them, as he called Abraham, Moses, and some prophets in the Old Testament, and as John the Baptist and the Apostles also were called by Christ in the New Testament ; or announces to them the call and command by intervening messengers, to whom he has appeared and spoken, as he called Aaron through Moses, and Elisha through Elijah. * * §81. "It is customary for the Anabaptists and enthusiasts to boast of such revelations, but mindful of the divine warning, Jer. 14 : 14, let us not hear them, but hold to that norm and rule according to which an immediate divine call may be distinguished from the seductions of the enthusiasts. God himself declares this, Deut. 13 : 1—3. Therefore, if he, who boasts of divine revelations, bring a strange doctrine, he is not to be regarded as immediately called, even though he may seem to firmly establish his call by means of miracles. The same rule is laid down, Jer. 23 : 21 ; 27 : 15 ; 29 : 9 ; viz., that whoever prophesies anything false, whether in doctrine or predictions, is not a prophet immediately called by God, but a most wicked seducer, because the Spirit of God by whom prophets are sent, is the Spirit of truth.

Gerhard's argument against any immediate call at the pre-

sent day, is the same as that of Chemnitz, viz. 1. "We are without the promise that at the present time, since the New Testament canon has been established, we ought to expect an immediate call." "2. No necessity of an immediate call appears." "3. From which we must infer that if those who glory in an immediate call, and boast of divine revelations, bring a new doctrine, different from that of Christ and the Apostles, they are not to be heard, nor to be regarded as lawfully called, even though they endeavor to establish their call by miracles, Mat. 24 : 24."

NO IMMEDIATE INNER CALL KNOWN IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The existence in the present period of an immediate *outward* call, and the necessity of this form of the call, was involved in the old struggle between the Reformers and some of the extreme Anabaptists, such as the Zwickau prophets, who pretended to have received outward revelations, and whose fanaticism was soon easily recognized.

Kindred, however, to this error, there was another theory of the call that gained for itself more adherents. Abandoning the idea of the necessity of an immediate *outward* revelation, it rested the call upon an immediate *inner* revelation of the Holy Spirit. Such was the theory, for instance, of Weigel from whose Postils, Gerhard quotes as follows: "Faithful preachers ought to be angels of God, i. e. they ought to be taught and sent by God, not by men: for those who themselves run without being called to preach, are mercenaries, such as we all are now without any exception; for who of us has been taught by God? who suffers himself to be called by God? Are we not all appointed from the Academy, and by favor and power?" Again: "You are a doctor, but you have not been promoted by the Holy Spirit, but by the academies, where no Holy Spirit has ever been found; you have not been called or sent by God, but you have been ordained, chosen and appointed by men, and therefore you cannot teach spiritual things." It was the theory of Schwenkfeldt, and Böhme and most of the mystics. It is the theory, at the pre-

sent day, of the Quakers, and is thus stated by Barclay in his Apology, (Proposition X., Intro. ;) "As by the light or gift of God, all true knowledge in things spiritual is received and revealed, so by the same, as it is manifested and received in the heart, by the strength and power thereof, every true minister of the gospel is ordained, prepared and supplied in the work of the ministry; and by the leading, moving and drawing hereof ought every evangelist and Christian pastor to be led and ordered in his labor and work of the gospel, both as to the place, where, the persons to whom, and as to the time wherein he is to minister. Moreover, they who have this authority may and ought to preach the gospel, *though without human commission or literature.*" What Barclay means by this "light or gift of God," can be understood by referring to Proposition II, "Of Immediate Revelation:" "By the revelation of the same Spirit, he hath manifested himself all along unto the sons of men; which revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward voices and appearances, dreams or *inward objective manifestations in the heart*, were of old the formal object of their faith, and remain yet so to be; since the object of the saints' faith is the same in all ages, though held forth under divers administrations. Moreover *these divine inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary* for the building up of true faith, neither do nor can ever contradict the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or right and sound reason. Yet from hence it will not follow that these divine revelations are to be subjected to the test, either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule and touchstone; for this divine revelation and inward illumination, is that which is evident and clear of itself."

To this professed call by an immediate impulse of the Spirit, our theologians deny not only an existence in the present state of the church, but also affirm that the immediate call was never of such a nature.

CHEMNITZ, *L. T.* (*De Ecclesia*, iii, p. 121): "The Immediate call is * * and not as the fanatics boast that they are forced to preach by some inner movement or other of the

Spirit. But in the immediate call, God himself either immediately appears or immediately addresses those whom he calls." GERHARD qualifies somewhat this statement of Chemnitz; yet still so as to exclude this inward form of an immediate call (*ut supra*): "To those whom God calls immediately,

* * he either himself appears and converses immediately with them, * * or announces to them the call and command by intervening messengers, to whom he has appeared and spoken." * * "Although we do not deny that such an inner inspiration and impulse concurred in the immediate call, yet an outward manifestation and confirmation of the immediate call were added, either through the appearance and declaration of God himself, or by the announcement of the Divine will, nor is there any doubt that this occurred, in the prophets and apostles who were immediately called, *by the special design of God to oppose the errors of the fanatics, who boast that they have been immediately called, when they imagine that they have been forced to preach by some inner impulse or other of the Spirit.*" So also QUENSTEDT, (iv. p. 395,) BAIER, (*De Min. Ecc.* § 3,) HOLLAZ, (*De Min. Ecc.* q. 5.)

The entire subject of the immediate call is admirably summed up by

HOLLAZ, *Examen Theologicum Prolegomenon* iii. q. 3): "The certainty of a call to the ministry is derived not from a new, peculiar and immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, but from mediate revelation contained in Holy Scripture. For Scripture teaches the gifts with which a suitable minister of the church should be endowed, 1 Tim. 3 : 1 seq. It likewise teaches that the church has the power of the keys of Heaven, Mt. 16 : 18, and therefore the power of entrusting the holy ministry to certain persons. If therefore a candidate of Theology knows (for the spirit of man knows what is in man, 1 Cor. 2 : 11,) that he has been divinely furnished with those gifts which Holy Scripture requires in a minister of the Church, and he sees at hand before his eyes a written call from any church, having the right to call him, he is certain, without any new and immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, of his lawful call to the ministry."

THE DOCTRINE "OF THE CALL," AS RELATED TO THE DOCTRINE
"CONCERNING THE WORD."

The call to the ministry being thus entirely dependent upon the word of God, any erroneous doctrine concerning the word, will necessarily result in an erroneous doctrine concerning the call, or any want of clearness on the doctrine concerning the word will end in either doubt and uncertainty, or positive error concerning the call. For how can we determine the call, whilst we are unable to determine the word?

The Romish doctrine of the ministry as a hierarchical order, transmitted by outward succession, is a corollary to their doctrine which asserts the incompleteness of the Sacred Scriptures as the word of God, and maintains that oral tradition is of equal authority with the written word. According to this theory, there is an *esoteric* or secret, as well as an *exoteric* or public word; and to hand down this esoteric word, there must be a succession of men, chosen in accordance with its requirements. Bishops are inspired in their selection of candidates for the ministry. Their commission is, therefore, the call from God: and the call is consequently entirely independent of and superior to the written word.

The Weigelian or Quaker doctrine of the ministry, differs from the Romish doctrine only *per accidens*. Essentially the two theories are identical. The written word is not sufficient. An inner light, or an *esoteric* word, is the true source of the call. In this *esoteric* word, or immediate call, and nowhere else do we hear the true voice of the Holy Spirit. Those who seek the Holy Spirit's voice in the outward word alone are not true ministers of Christ. The call must be entirely independent of and superior to the written word.

Well were it if the doctrine of the insufficiency of Holy Scripture, as the means through which the Holy Spirit speaks to us, were restricted to the Romish church and the mystical sects; but to our surprise we often find it prevalent in a *subtle* form, where in its grosser form, it is denied and combatted. Wherever it appears there we find either the Romish or Quaker theories of the ministry taught, or more commonly the necessity of a divine call insisted upon, and then the question

as to what the call is, shrouded in doubt, as though it belonged to those *arcana* which nothing but the inner light dare reveal.

Thus many Protestants, whilst affirming that Holy Scripture is the word of God, deny the doctrine of the inseparable connection between the Holy Spirit and Holy Scripture, and maintain that there is an inner illumination beyond and in addition to that offered and communicated by the Spirit through the written word.

LATTER HELVETIC CONFESSION, (Art. xviii, Niemeyer, p. 506): "Let us believe, therefore, that God in his word teaches us publicly through his ministers; but that within through the Holy Spirit he moves the hearts of his elect to faith."

CALVIN (Institutes Book iii, c. xxiv. §8, Eng. Trans. of Presb. Board, ii; p. 187): "There is a universal call, by which God in the external preaching of the word, invites all, indiscriminately to come to him, even those to whom he intends it as a savor of death and an occasion of heavier condemnation. There is also a special call, with which he, for the most part, favors only believers, when by the inward illumination of his Spirit, he causes the word preached to sink into their hearts." So also Book iv, c. xiv, §8: "The Lord first teaches and instructs us by his word; then confirms us by the sacraments; and lastly shines upon our minds by the light of his Spirit."

Whilst DR. HODGE, in the first volume of his *Theology*, completely overthrows the position of Schleiermacher that the inspiration of the sacred writers was nothing supernatural, and that of Maurice and others that every believer possesses the gift of inspiration just as the sacred writers possessed it, yet in volume iii. (pp. 479—485), he attempts by a long argument to disprove "the inherent, divine and constant power of the word," as the means of the Spirit's influences. Thus (p. 483): "The theory in question is contrary to Scripture, in that it assumes that the reason why one man is saved and another not, is simply that one resists the supernatural power of the word, and another does not." * * "This Lutheran doctrine is inconsistent with the experience of be-

lievers individually and collectively. On the day of Pentecost, what fell upon the Apostles and the brethren assembled with them? It was no '*verbum vocale*;' no sound of words; and no new external revelation. The Spirit of God Himself, enlightened their minds and enable them to remember and understand all that Christ had taught, and they spoke every man as the Spirit (not the word) gave them utterance. Here was a clear manifestation of the Spirit's acting directly on the minds of the Apostles. * * What, according to the Lutheran theory, is meant by being full of the Holy Ghost? or by the indwelling of the Spirit? or by the testimony of the Spirit? or by the demonstration of the Spirit? or by the unction of the Holy One that teaches all things? or by the outpouring of the Spirit?" So also vol. ii., p. 650.

So far as these arguments possess any weight, we oppose to them the following from vol. i, p. 100, of the same work. It will be perceived that the author strikes one note when attempting to bolster up the Calvinistic doctrine of election, and another when contending against Mysticism.

"The appeal has always been to the law and testimony. The prophets came saying, 'Thus saith the Lord.' Men were required to believe and obey what was commanded to them, and not what the Spirit revealed to each individual. *It was the outward and not the inward word to which they were to attend.*

* * In no case do we find the Apostles calling upon the people, whether Jews or Gentiles, to look within themselves, to listen to the inner word. They were to listen to the outward word; to believe what they heard, and were to pray for the Holy Spirit to enable them to understand, receive and obey what was thus externally made known to them." If to this we add that in the outward word, the Holy Spirit is waiting, and through it communicates Himself to all who thus earnestly listen to the word, exciting within them the desire to receive it, and then enabling them to believe, and through the word communicating his graces, we have all that the strictest Lutheran could desire.*

* QUESTEDT, (iii., p. 467) thus treats the Calvinistic distinction of an inner and outward call to the kingdom of grace: "We admit the distinc-

But wherever the former theory is held, the doctrine of the call to the ministry is obscured. The individual is turned away from the revealed word of God, to search within himself for an undefined inner call. The candidate must declare that he has been "inwardly moved of the Holy Ghost" to assume the office, whilst but little importance is attached to any test whereby a true inner call, by the Holy Spirit speaking in the outward word, may be distinguished from the vagaries of the individual's fancy. If the individual himself be a person of good character, and have decided that he possesses the inner call, the fact of his call to the ministry is regarded either as sufficient, or at least such as should not be denied. In ordinary cases, ordination, or the judgment of the church is necessary for entrance into the ministry, yet simply as a confirmation of the inner call, upon which everything depends. And yet, even Vinet, with all his moderation on this subject, remarks: "No man, nor body of men, can know with entire certainty that we are called; as, on the other hand, they cannot, in every case, declare with certainty that we are not called. In short, there are times and places in which a man can not be sent except by himself, and in which he who ought to be called is the last who would be called." (*Pastoral Theology*, p. 99).

IS THERE THEN NO INNER CALL?

Our theologians are far from denying the importance of what may in a certain sense be termed the inner call; but insist upon two things, viz., first that this call be rightly understood and not confounded with anything else, and, secondly, that it be assigned its proper place.

Nothing can be more severe than the rebukes given in the *Smaller and Larger Catechisms*, to worldly-minded pastors, who have entered the ministry simply to eke out a living, and without any love of souls (*Introduction to Smaller Catechism*. Do. to *Larger Catechism*). So too all our theologians

tion, but so as not to oppose the inner to the outward call, or separate the one from the other; since the outward call is the means and organ of the inner call, and through this God is efficacious in the hearts of men."

insist upon a close adherence, in judging the qualifications for the ministry, to the rules laid down in the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. 3 : 1—6 ; Titus 1 : 6—9, which clearly forbid entrance into the office for any other reason than devotion to the work of the Master. They recognize also a true movement of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the individual, in leading him through the study of the outward word of God, to the conviction that it is his duty to seek the holy office. If this be understood as the inner call, they are willing to accept the term ; but still regard this conviction, wrought though it is by the Holy Ghost, not as the call properly speaking to the ministry, but only as preparatory to the call. Where an outward call does not follow, this inward call is not to be regarded farther than to lead the individual to persevere in the proper way to obtain the outward call. Where an outward call cannot be given any one, and the individual is still constrained by this inner call, there by virtue of the powers conferred upon the spiritual priesthood, he may exercise his office, until one properly endowed with an outward call can be obtained. Where, on the other hand, notwithstanding the fact that there is no inner call, the outward call is given, that outward call by itself constitutes the individual a true Christian minister. The inner call may succeed instead of precede the outward call. Or the inner call may never be heard ; the Church may have made a grievous mistake in entrusting the holy office to such hands ; but the person thus appointed still remains a minister, until he either voluntarily abandons the functions of the office, or the Church deprive him of them. To contend otherwise is to fall into the error of the Donatists and Novatians, as condemned by the Augsburg Confession, Art. viii. The outward call alone is, therefore, to be accounted the true call ; the mediate inner call, through the outward word, is either a call to seek the office, or to exercise it after the outward call has been received.

CHEMNITZ, (iii., p. 119) on 1 Tim. 3 : 1 : "To desire the office of a bishop, is not without a lawful call to take upon yourself ministerial functions ; but he who understands the

foundations of heavenly doctrine, and is to a certain extent endowed with the gift of teaching, in offering his labor to God and the Church, by this very act, seeks for nothing else than that God, by a lawful call, may declare whether, when, and where, he wishes to use his ministry in the Church. And such a one ought to be endowed with such a mind, that, if a lawful call would not follow this petition, he would not take it upon himself, but would say with David, 2 Sam. 2 : 26 : "But if he thus say, I have no delight in thee, behold, here am I, let him do to me as seemeth good unto him."

GERHARD, *L. T. (De Min. Ecc. §75)* : "We grant that God, by an inner impulse and inspiration, breathes into some this disposition to undertake the ministry of the church, without regard to dangers or difficulties ; to which belongs also that mysterious impulse by which some are drawn to the study of Theology, We also grant that it is absolutely required of the minister, that he be not allured either by ambition or avarice, or any other wicked desire, but that induced by the pure love of God, and the desire of edifying the Church, he should accept the ecclesiastical office offered him ; and if any one desire to apply, in a proper sense, the name of secret call, to these dispositions, both of which are especially worthy of praise, we do not greatly object. Yet in the meantime we give the warning, that, in order that the doors be not opened to the disturbances of the Anabaptists or the revelations of the enthusiasts, no one, by reason of this secret call, ought to take upon himself the duties of the ministerial office, unless there be added to it the outward and solemn call of the Church." This inner impulse he afterwards declares to be not the call, but "an accident of the same," and a description of the proper disposition or quality in the person called.

THE CALL IS GIVEN THROUGH THE CHURCH.

Thus the *Smalcald Articles* (Appendix, Müller 341, Henkel 404) declare : "The churches undoubtedly retain the authority to call, to elect, and to ordain ministers. And this authority is a privilege which God has given especially to the

Church, and it cannot be taken away from the Church by any human power, as Paul testifies, Eph. 4 : 8, 11, 12. And among these gifts which belong to the Church, he enumerates pastors and teachers, and adds that these were given for the edifying of the body of Christ. Wherefore, it follows that wherever there is a true church, there is also the power to elect and ordain ministers * * To this point the declarations of Christ pertain, which show that the keys are given to the whole Church, and not merely to some particular persons, Matt. 18 : 20. Finally, this is also confirmed by the declaration of Peter, where he says, 'ye are a royal priesthood,' 1 Pet. 2 : 9."

The relation of the spiritual priesthood to the ministry, is, therefore, according to the conception of our Lutheran authorities, this: The spiritual priesthood does not possess the right to the ordinary exercise of the functions of the ministry, but only in its collective capacity the right to choose, in God's name, certain persons for the office.

CHEMNITZ, *Examen (De Sacramento Ordinis, caput iii)*: "The Church has the command to call and appoint ministers."

CHEMNITZ, *L. T. (De Ecclesia, p. 123)*: "God does not ordinarily use, for a mediate call, the ministry of angels. * * But Christ has committed the keys to the Church as to his bride, Matt. 18 : 17, and has promised that whatever they agree upon, and ask of Him, concerning any matter upon earth, He will also give from His Father who is in heaven. He has committed the word and sacraments to the same. Just as Paul declares concerning God's ancient people, Rom. 3 : 2, that 'to them were entrusted the oracles of God,' and Rom. 9 : 4, 'to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' And the ministry belongs to the Church, Eph. 4 : 12. For all things belong to the Church, 1 Cor. 3 : 11. And hence Paul, when 1 Tim. 3 : 15 he had been treating of the mediate call, added that the Church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth.'"

HUTTER, *Compend* : "A minister is a person regularly called by the Church."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Eccl.* §85) adopts the very words of Chemnitz above given, and adds: "To the Church, then, belongs the delegated right, as they say, of appointing suitable ministers of the word."

BAIER, *Comp. Th. Pos.* (*De Min. Eccl.* §3, (c)): "For she has the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Matt. 16 : 18 ; 18 : 17, given her as a bride of Christ her groom, and therefore as it is her prerogative to open and close the kingdom of heaven, so is it also her prerogative to appoint ministers, through whom she may open and close the same."

HOLLAZ, *Examen* (*De Min. Eccl.*): "A mediate or ordinary call is that by which God calls a certain person to the ministry of the Church, through the intervention of the judgment of those men who are members of the Church." So also QUENSTEDT, iv. p. 402.

THE CHURCH IN COMMUNICATING THIS CALL, MUST BE CONSTRAINED THERETO AND GUIDED THEREIN SOLELY THROUGH THE WORD OF GOD AS REVEALED IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The church no more than the ministry, or the individual believer, possesses any *esoteric* word, by which to appoint ministers. There is no magical power inherent in its decisions. They avail only when in harmony with Holy Scripture, as it is only, as the church follows the directions of the written word, that it can be regarded as an instrument through which the Holy Spirit speaks.

CHEMNITZ, *L. T.* (iii. p. 124): "The Lord of the harvest has given the Church a form, and so to speak an instruction as to the character in doctrine and in life of those persons who are to be chosen and called to the ministry of the word. 1 Tim. 3 : 2—6 ; Titus 1 : 6—11. Let the Church in the true fear of God adopt this rule for her guidance, inasmuch as God himself wishes by this means to call and send laborers into his harvest."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Eccl.* §88): "According to the norm of Scripture, therefore, the doctrine of every pastor must be accurately examined, and according to this as a rule and plummet, Ps. 19 : 4, pastors are to be judged ; ordinary pastors are to be heard, but on the condition that they also listen to Christ speaking in his word, teach those things

which Christ commanded, and deliver no other than the true doctrine of Christ, Mt. 28 : 20 ; John 10 : 1, 2 ; 2 John 10."

If it be urged against this position that the power of setting apart ministers, is derived from the power of the keys, as independent of the written word and superior to it, our church writers, in their loyalty to Scripture, find no difficulty in giving a satisfactory answer. For the power of the keys is not an arbitrary power, but one which is bound to the word of God. It is simply the application to the individual of what God's written word declares concerning his salvation. Hence the Church must see to it that only such men are allowed to exercise this power, as fully understand what God's word teaches, and are competent in the fear of God to apply its general principles to individual cases.

Prior, therefore, to entrance upon the ministry, an examination must be made of the candidate to determine whether he have the proper qualifications for the call.

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Ecc.* §166): "The Apostle with great earnestness admonishes the bishop Timothy, 1 Tim. 5 : 21, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,' where the last clause is aetiological to the former, and therefore in ordination hands are not to be laid suddenly, *i. e.* not without careful judgment and a diligent examination by the bishop, so that he may not become a partaker of other men's sins."

Ib. §168: "In this examination, diligent search should be made into the qualifications of the candidate for ordination, whether he have the ability to perform aright the duties of a minister of the church, 2 Tim. 2 : 2. If you say that the apostle denies that any one is sufficient for an office so important and so difficult, 2 Cor. 2 : 16, I reply that shortly afterwards in the succeeding chapter, he explains this, by saying, 2 Cor. 3 : 5; 'But our sufficiency is of God.' To this sufficiency belong: 1. Sincerity of confession * * 2. Skill in teaching * * 3. Integrity of character."

THE CALL COMMUNICATED BY THE CHURCH PROCEEDS ¹¹) NOT FROM THE MINISTRY ALONE.

CHEMNITZ, *Examen* (*De Sacramento Ordinis*, Pr. 485): "The

question in this place is, By whose voice and suffrage ought the election and call to be made so that it can be determined to be divine, *i. e.* that God himself, through these means, chooses, calls and sends laborers into his harvest. In Holy Scripture there are certain and clear examples pertaining to this subject. Acts 1, when another is to be substituted for Judas, Peter proposes the matter in the presence not only of the Apostles, but also of the rest of the disciples, as believers then were called; and the number of these who were assembled at the same place was about a hundred and twenty. * * Acts 6, when deacons were to be chosen and called, the Apostles were unwilling to arrogate to themselves the right of the call. * * Acts 14, Paul and Barnabas appoint presbyters in every church, in which they preached the gospel. But they did not take upon themselves alone the right and authority of an election and call, but Luke uses the term *χειροτονησαντες*, which 2 Cor. 8 employs concerning the election made by the vote of the church. * * And Acts 15, when persons were to be chosen to be sent with a commission to the church at Antioch, Luke says that it seemed good to 'the Apostles and elders with the whole church' 'to select Barnabas and Saul.' "

CHEMNITZ *L. T.* (*De Ecclesia* iii: 123): "Inasmuch as the ministers are not the whole church, but only a part of it, Eph. 4: 11; neither are they lords of the church, but helpers and overseers, 2 Cor. 1: 24; 1 Peter 5: 3; therefore, they neither can nor ought to assume the mediate call to themselves alone, the remaining members being excluded."

BAIER, *Comp. Th. Pos.* (*De Min. Ecc.*, §iii. (c)): "If we consider that the church is a republic, and that the ministers of the word are as it were the magistrates or managers of the public business, on whom the entrusted care of the whole state rests, it is easily understood that the power of appointing these resides in itself and by its own nature, in the entire church, neither does it belong to any part unless transferred to a certain part by the common consent of all."

QUENSTEDT, *Theo. Did.—Pol.* (*De Min. Ecc.*, q. ii.): "The power of electing and calling ministers of the word by divina

right, is not in the power of the priests or ecclesiastical order alone."

HOLLAZ *Examen*, (*De Min. Ecc.*, q. vii.) mentions the following argument of the Papists, and replies: "The Apostles appointed bishops without the vote of the magistracy and people, e. g. Paul appointed Titus bishop in Crete, Tit. 1 : 5. Therefore, bishops and pastors are at the present day to be called without the vote of the people." "We reply : "There is a distinction between a church which is to be planted, or first established, and one which has been planted and established. When a church was first to be planted and established among the heathen, the vote of the people was not to be expected, and the authority of an unbelieving magistracy was not to be regarded. When the Apostles sent bishops and pastors to people who were yet to be converted, the consent of the hearers was not required ; but when the church had been planted and established, they did not send forth ministers to the churches without the consent of the people, Acts 1 : 24 ; 6 : 3 ; 14 : 23."

b) NOR FROM THE PEOPLE ALONE.

CHEMNITZ *Examen* (*De Sacramento Ordinis, ut supra*) : "But they," (i. e. the Apostles) "do not renounce the care of the call, and leave it to the blind and confused pleasure of the common people or multitude, but they are as it were the directors and controllers of the election and call ; for they give the doctrine and rule, according to which the latter should elect."

CHEMNITZ, *L. T.* (*De Ecclesia* iii. p. 123) : "It is certainly and clearly evident, both from the commands and examples of Scripture, Tit. 1 : 5 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 2 ; Acts 14 : 24, that those who are already in the ministry, and profess the sacred doctrine, should be employed whenever through a mediate call the ministry is entrusted to any one. * * Therefore, the election and call of ministers of the church should not be submitted either to the ministers alone and the magistrate alone, or to the ignorance and inconsiderateness of the promiscuous multitude alone."

GERHARD, *De Min. Ecc.* §86.) "In general we say that neither to the presbytery alone, nor to the magistracy alone,

much less to the judgment of the promiscuous and ignorant multitude is the appointment of ministers to be submitted, but the right to give the call belongs to the whole church."

So also QUENSTEDT and HOLLAZ, *passim*.

c) NOR FROM THE MAGISTRACY ALONE.

CHEMNITZ *L. T.* (iii. p. 123); "Yet a Christian and pious magistrate is not permitted without the will and consent of the ministry and the rest of the church, to call and appoint ministers in the church. For just as the Pope of Rome, with his adherents, has committed sacrilege in this that he has withdrawn the choice and call of ministers of the church, and has transferred it to himself and to his adherents; so also is the magistrate subject to the same charge, when to the exclusion of the ministry and the rest of the church, he claims for himself alone the power of appointing the ministry in the church. For a pious magistrate is not the whole church, but only a member of it."

d) BUT FROM THE WHOLE CHURCH, BOTH MINISTRY AND PEOPLE, AND WHERE CHURCH AND STATE ARE UNITED UNDER DEVOUT CHRISTIAN RULERS, THE MAGISTRACY ALSO.

CHEMNITZ, *Examen (De Sacramento Ordinis, Pr. 485)*: "It is useful to observe this fact in the history of the Apostles, that the ministers and the rest of the church sometimes concurrently elected those whom they judged suitable, as Acts 1. Sometimes the church proposed and selected them, and the election was submitted to the judgment of the apostles for approval, Acts 6. But often the Apostles who could judge better concerning these matters, proposed to the churches those whom they judged to be suitable for the ministry, and when the vote and consent of the church were added, the call was ratified. Thus Paul sends Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, etc., to the churches. Thus in Acts 14, elders are proposed to whom the church agrees through *ἡ ἐκκλησία*. Sometimes also some offered their work to the church, 1 Tim. 3: 1. Yet always in the time of the Apostles the consent of the church, and the judgment and approval of the presbytery accompanied and were necessary to a lawful call. Thus Titus was appoint-

ed to govern and direct the election of elders in Crete, so that this might be done in a proper way, and that he might confirm the election properly made. For in reference to the appointment of elders, Paul, Titus 1, uses the same word which is found in Acts 14, where mention is made at the same time both of *χειροτονία* and the appointment of elders: and he commands Titus to rebuke those sharply who are not sound in the faith, and do not teach what they should, *i. e.* as he more clearly says, 1 Tim. 5 : 22 : "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins."

"These examples of apostolic history clearly show that the election or call belongs to the whole Church in a fixed manner, so that in the election or call, both presbyters and people may have their own parts. * * Afterwards when emperors and kings embraced the Christian religion, their will, judgment and authority also were applied to and required, because they ought to be nurses of the Church (Is. 49 : 23), and, according to the example of Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, a supervision of the right appointment and administration of the Church has been entrusted to them. * * *

This is the opinion of the primitive Apostolic Church, and of the ancient Church, concerning the lawful election and call of the ministers of the word and sacraments; and those churches which now have been established according to the word of God, hold this opinion as applying to places where there is a presbytery embracing that faithful form of words which is according to doctrine, a devout magistracy, and a people understanding doctrine and loving piety. But where in the time of the apostles the priests were idolatrous, the magistracy impious, and the people walking in darkness, there in the beginning the ministry could not be established through such an election, but either the Apostles went thither, or sent others elsewhere properly chosen, in order that these might first lay the foundation. Thus Acts 13, Paul and Barnabas are sent to the Gentiles: and Acts 11, the gospel is thus spread to Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch. Thus Paul had many persons about him whom he sent hither and thither to the churches. But when the churches had been for some

time founded, the ministry was established in the manner which we have stated, Acts 14."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Eccl.* §85): "Since in the Church there are three distinct classes or orders, the ecclesiastical, the political and the domestic; or the presbytery, the magistracy and the people, of all of whom, as members, the Church consists, no class belonging to the Church should be altogether excluded from this work, but in the mediate call of ministers each should be allowed its own parts and duties. 1. That bishops and presbyters are to be employed when the ministry is to be entrusted to any one, is evident both from the apostolic command and approved examples of Scripture, Acts 14: 23; 1 Tim. 4: 14; 5: 22; 2 Tim. 2: 2; Titus 1: 5. The same is confirmed by a clear reason. For those who have been previously engaged in the ministry, and who profess the sound doctrine, can judge most correctly concerning the qualifications of those who are to be called to the office of teaching."

Ib. (§86): "The reason that in this practice no mention is made of the magistracy, is found in the fact that the magistracy was not as yet Christian, and did not embrace the doctrine, the preaching of which is committed to ministers. If it had been truly Christian its own part would also have been assigned it, since from the ordination of God it is a nurse of the Church, Is. 49: 23; a guard of both tables, Deut. 17: 19, a shield of the earth to the people of Abraham, Ps. 47: 9, a part of whose office it is to lift up the gates that the King of Glory may enter, Ps. 24: 7, * * And in addition * * we should add the examples of the pious kings of the O. T. for instance, David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, etc., 2 Kings 18: 4; 22: 2; 1 Chr. 23: 2; 2 Chr. 17: 6 *sqq.*; 34, and the pious emperors of the N. T., as Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, etc."

The argument of Gerhard proving that the laity also should participate in the call, is very full. We present a brief outline: He proves his position "I. From the Scriptures. 1. The delivery of the keys to the whole Church. Compare Mt.

16 : 19 with 18 : 17, 18 ; 1 Cor. 5 : 4 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 6. 2. From the testing of teachers. Whoever is charged with the duty of distinguishing teachers from seducers, of testing sound doctrine, of distinguishing the voice of Christ, the chief Shepherd, from the voice of false shepherds, of following no other but fleeing from him, of anathematizing those who preach a gospel other than that which was preached by the apostles, has the duty assigned him, in his own manner and order, to call ministers of the Church. But by the force of the divine command, all the former duties rest upon the sheep of Christ, or hearers, Mt. 7 : 15 ; John 5 : 39 ; 10 : 27 ; Gal. 1 : 9 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 19, 21 ; 1 John 4 : 1 ; 2 John 10, 11. Therefore the latter dare not be denied them. 3. From the name of ministers. They are ministers of the Church, and therefore the Church must have the right to call them, 1 Cor. 3 : 21, 22 ; 2 Cor. 1 : 24 ; 1 Pet. 5 : 2, 3. 4. From the advantage of the hearers. If the minister is to have a good report of those who are without, 1 Tim. 3 : 7, how much more necessary is it that he should have this report of the Church over which he is to preside. * * 6. The calling of ministers with the consent and by the vote of the Church, over which they are appointed, cherishes mutual concord between hearers and pastors, and removes dissension." "2. From the practice of the Apostles, Acts 1 : 23 ; 6 : 3 ; 14 : 23." Each of these passages is explained at great length, and the exceptions of Bellarmine against their application in this connection are refuted. "3. The practice of the primitive church is proved from : 1. The decrees of the Councils, 2. The sayings of the fathers. 3. Approved examples of a lawful call."

The arguments of Bellarmine against the rights of the laity are then successively presented and refuted. The most significant one, perhaps, is : "7. *The disadvantages following an election by the people.* 'In the first place the people are ignorant, and cannot judge, even if they very greatly desire to do so, as to whether one is suitable or not for the priesthood. In the second place, if the people have the power of electing, it will necessarily follow that those will always be

put in office whom the worse and the less intelligent desire ; for the larger number will prevail, and in every association there are more wicked than good, more foolish than wise persons.' We reply : 1. This is rightly opposed to the Anabaptists, who grant the power of election to the ignorant multitude, and exclude the magistracy and presbytery. In the election we neither approve nor introduce confusion, nor grant to the people alone the right of electing." * * 2. Although the people cannot give such an exact judgment concerning the learning and qualifications of the one to be elected as the presbytery can, yet from their catechetical instruction they can give some judgment concerning his purity of doctrine, from the trial sermon some judgment as to his gifts, and from conversation or the report of others some judgment as to his character, and hence they should not be altogether excluded from his election. 3. The practice of our churches shows that the people can be admitted without confusion to the election of ministers. * * If these disadvantages would follow the election of pastors by the people as such, *i. e.* directly and *per se*, and do not rather occur * * *per accidens*, how did it happen that the apostles gave the people the power of making the choice.?"

THAT EACH PORTION OF THE CHURCH MAY DISCHARGE ARIGHT THE DUTY ENTRUSTED TO IT IN THE CALL OF MINISTERS, A CERTAIN FIXED AND DEFINITE ORDER IS DESIRABLE.

CHEMNITZ *L. T.* (*De Ecclesia* iii. 123): "Inasmuch as God is not a God of confusion, but of order, 1 Cor. 14 : 33 ; in order that all things be done decently and in order, the matter of the election and call of ministers, both in the time of the Apostles and since their times in the older and purer Church, was always transacted in a certain order *by the chief members of the Church in the name and by the consent of the entire Church*. Thus Acts 1 : 5, Peter presents a description of the character of the person who should be chosen ; and afterwards the Apostles, together with the Church make the choice. Acts 6 : 2. The Apostles propose the election of deacons to administer the external affairs of the Church ; they also describe of what character these persons should be, and

according to that rule the Church elects. But afterwards they submit those whom they have elected to the judgment of the apostles, who confirm the election by their approval. Often the Apostles also proposed suitable persons to the Church. Thus Paul sent Titus, Timothy, Sylvanus and others; and the Church afterwards approved this election by its vote and consent, Acts 14 : 22; 2 Cor. 8 : 16. Titus is proposed with another to convey alms to Jerusalem, and the Church agrees. Thus nevertheless the election was made by the Church, but yet in a definite order."

GERHARD L. T. (*De Min. Ecc.* §86): "This order is most properly observed, if the matter of the election and call of ministers be transacted by certain *chief members of the Church, in the name and by the consent of the entire Church*. Although it seems scarcely possible to lay down a certain rule, in speaking most particularly, and descending to particular cases, since the rights of the patron vary, and that which has been agreed in regard to this matter is of much importance, * * yet speaking generally and to give an example we may say that the examination, ordination and inauguration belong to the *presbytery*, the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the *Christian magistrate*, and the consent, vote and approval, or according to circumstances the demand to the people. Therefore the general principle that pastors should be called with the consent of the Church, or that no one should be intruded upon the Church when it is unwilling, has express testimonies in Scripture, and was approved by the constant practice of the primitive Church; but the form of the election *in specie* varies for sometimes the vote of the people was necessary in nominating persons, and sometimes their approval was required for those before nominated, Acts 1 : 15, 23, 26; 6 : 3; 14 : 23; 1 Cor. 16 : 3; 2 Cor. 8 : 19; 1 Tim 3 : 7; 5 : 22; 4 : 14."

QUENSTEDT, T. D-P. (*De Min. Ecc.* iii. 402): "Each part of the Church has its own functions in the calling of ministers. It is the office of the clergy to examine the candidates for the ministry, to inquire into their learning and life, to consider and judge concerning the gifts necessary for the ministry of

the Church, and to inaugurate them by the laying on of hands. It belongs to the Christian magistrate to nominate them, to present them when called, and to ratify their examination. The duty of the people is to give the call, to approve by their vote and testimony, and to elect."

HOLLAZ, *Examen (De Min. Ecc.*, q. vii. Prob. *b*): "The call of ministers generally and comprehensively considered (as embracing election, ordination and the call specially so called) should be so attended to by the whole Church, and all its three orders, that due order be preserved and confusion be avoided. For God is not a God of confusion, but of order, 1 Cor. 14 : 33. Therefore 'the examination, ordination and inauguration belong to the presbytery, the nomination, presentation and confirmation to the Christian magistrate, and the consent, vote and approval to the people.'"

A definite mode must, therefore, be agreed upon by the Church. The word of God nowhere specifies this mode. The Church is hence at liberty to adopt any mode whereby the end in view may be reached, and all parts of the Church be guaranteed its own rights. Hence, with proper limitations, *the delegation to representatives of power originally vested in the Church as a whole, is both scriptural and Lutheran.*

GERHARD, L. T. (*De Min. Ecc.*, §106): "Among us consistories have been established, composed of highly respectable ecclesiastical and political persons, who represent the Church, neither does the whole multitude of the people participate in the election, but the power of speaking and acting is entrusted in the name of the rest to certain persons, viz. elders. In some Churches, the people, relinquishing in a certain sense their own rights, have handed over this part to their magistrates, and such of the ministry as unite in the same confessions, and to the choice thus made they quietly acquiesce. In other Churches they transfer their own power to certain highly respectable persons who transact all things in the name of the people. In neither mode, does the right to call ministers cease to belong to the whole Church; for the right is entrusted to the fidelity of others, and is not lost, since

each one with a free will for a time relinquishes his right, neither can it tend to the loss or damage of right."

QUENSTEDT, *T. D-P. (De Min. Ecc. iv. p. 402)*: "To avoid confusion in the election of bishops and presbyters, there have been established church consistories or presbyteries composed of honored ecclesiastical and political men, who represent the Church and are charged with the duty of furthering the business of the Church, and inquiring into the studies, the life and the character of those who are to be ordained."

(p. 403): "Bishops or teachers cannot alone represent the Church, since the hearers also are included in its definition; but the presbytery can represent the Church, to which belong not only those who labor in the word, but also the elders, *i. e.* very highly respected members of the Church, set over the business of the Church, who together with the ministry constitute the presbytery, or as we at present call it, the consistory." So also BAIER (*De Eccl. §xxx.*)

THE CALL HAS REFERENCE TO A PARTICULAR PLACE.

CHEMNITZ, *L. T. (De Ecc. iii. 124)*: "What we have above said concerning the call of the Apostles that it extends itself to the whole earth, we cannot now say also concerning those who have been mediately called. For teachers (*doctores*), pastors, bishops, presbyters are called to certain churches, and have not absolute power of teaching everywhere or in all churches, Acts 14 : 22; Titus 1 : 5. And thus God through a special call is accustomed to show in what place He wishes to use the services of any one. Therefore by virtue of this call they do not have the power to teach in other churches, to which they do not have a special call. Hence in the Council of Chalcedon, Canon vi., and, according to Gratian, Canon xvi., there was a statute that no one ought to be absolutely ordained, unless to a certain and special church."

GERHARD, *L. T. (De Min. Ecc. §138)*: "A mediate call is to a certain place, since among other points of difference, the immediate call of the Apostles is commonly thought to differ from the mediate call of bishops, presbyters, pastors and teachers in this, that the former received absolute power, yea

the command to preach everywhere, Matt. 28 : 19 ; Mark 16 : 15 ; Rom. 10 : 18 ; Col. 1 : 28. But the latter had a certain flock committed them in a certain definite place. Thus Acts 14 : 23 ; Tit. 1 : 5 ; 1 Pet. 5 : 2."

Ib. (§158): "The question is asked whether one should be ordained who has not as yet been called to a definite place. We answer: No, because ordination is the declaration and witness of the call, and hence where no call has preceded, ordination ought by no means to be conferred.

ORDINATION IS NOT THE CALL, AND, THEREFORE, IS NOT A RITE BY WHICH MEN ARE INVESTED WITH MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY. IT IS ONLY A CEREMONY BY WHICH THE CALL IS PUBLICLY RECOGNIZED.

Thus the SMALCALD ARTICLES teach (Appendix, Müller 344, Henkel, 404): "In former times the people elected pastors and bishops; then the bishop living in or near the same place, came and, by the laying on of hands, confirmed those elected; and at that time ordination was nothing else than this approbation."

CHEMNITZ, *J. T.* (*De Ecc.* iv. p. 126): "If the lawful call be in accordance with those matters hitherto mentioned, what therefore does the rite of public ordination confer? For in the Romish church this rite is employed without any regard being had to the call. And if any one be ordained they think that he has sufficient power to teach, absolve and administer the sacraments, even though he be without a lawful call. On the other hand, there are some not only among the Anabaptists, who have altogether rejected this rite; but even elsewhere they sometimes dispute very bitterly concerning it. For sometimes cases happen in which some one has a call and is prevented from betaking himself to a higher church, in which to receive the rite of ordination. The question, therefore, is whether his ministry is invalid. Some affirm this, and others deny it, since the rite of ordination is not necessary, provided the call be lawful. But yet on account of those who run and are not sent, the call ought to have a public testimony. And the rite of ordination is nothing else

than such a public bearing of testimony, by which that call in the sight of God, and in his name, is declared to be lawful and divine; and by this rite, as by a public designation, the ministry is committed by the consent and approval of the whole Church, to the one who has been called. Thus Paul, although immediately called, yet is sent to Ananias, that he may put his hands upon him, that the Church may be sure of the call, Acts 9 : 17, and afterwards Acts 13 : 3. When he was about to be sent to the Gentiles, he was again, by the laying on of hands, appointed a teacher of the Gentiles. * * If therefore this was done in reference to one who was immediately called, how much more becoming is it to do this in reference to mediate calls? Although therefore ordination does not *make* a call, yet if any one has been lawfully called, this rite is a declaration and public confirmation that the call which preceded is legitimate."

GERHARD, *L. T.* (*De Min. Ecc.* §139): "Ordination is a public and solemn declaration or attestation, through which the ministry of the Church is committed by the Church to a suitable person called thereto, to which he is consecrated by prayer and the laying on of hands, rendered more certain of his lawful call, and solemnly and seriously and publicly in the sight of the entire church admonished concerning his duty; for which reasons we preserve the rite of ordination inviolate in our churches."

HOLLAZ, *Ex. The.* (*De Min. Ecc.* q. ix. Prob. a)): "Although therefore ordination does not constitute an election and call, but presupposes it; yet if any one have been lawfully called, this church rite declares and publicly confirms that call, which preceded it, as lawful."

We have thus endeavored to present with all impartiality and fairness a summary of the principles laid down by our great theologians, concerning certain points involved in controversies, touching the nature of the ministry, at present occupying the attention of our church. Other topics, of great importance connected with the subject, our limits compel us, at least for the present, to withhold.

ARTICLE III.

SHOULD CLERGYMEN STUDY NATURAL SCIENCE?

By Rev. J. C. KOLLER, A. M.

I propose in this article to consider the inquiry: *Whether there are any inducements for clergymen to engage in Scientific Study?* The readers of the REVIEW will demand no apology for such a discussion, in these pages, at a time when science has emphatically become the "characteristic pursuit of the age," and much of the alleged opposition to Religion, incurred by science, is beginning to be regarded unjust.

Moreover, although the preaching of the gospel is the clergyman's first and foremost duty, it is admitted by all that the second and none the less important is the demonstration of the Gospel to be preached. And, whilst it would perhaps be a mark of unfaithfulness to the pastoral calling to subordinate the former to the latter, it is an evidence of unfaithfulness to God and the claims of His government to ignore or lightly esteem the works of nature.

A consideration of the question suggests:

1. That the intimate relationship between the natural sciences and theology may be regarded as an inducement to blend and utilize these as *one* means to promote religion. The ultimate design of each is the same. The efforts now made in certain quarters to prove them irreconcilable, originates in a manifest aversion to religion; for the evident disposition of the enemies of Christianity is to show that science disproves a designing God, hence this parading of nature and revelation side by side as opponents. It is much to be regretted, for the sake of the Christian Religion, that its defenders, by fastidious indifference or persistent silence should give countenance to the supposed disagreement. The fact that there is a separated course of study between ecclesias-

tical and natural theology is not so much by reason of any necessary distinction as by reason of convenience. The old idea of an agreement between natural and biblical revelation is not yet disproved by the so-called new philosophies of the day. Although, the most reliable interpreters of nature, for good reasons, make no organized effort to establish this agreement, the spirit and manner of their teaching are a sufficient warrant of their sentiments. Sometimes, however, we meet with some sharply defined statement which removes all doubt as to their opinions. For instance, Agassiz, in his last contribution to scientific literature, wrote: "Science is one; whether we investigate language, philosophy, history or physics, we are dealing with the same problem, culminating in the same knowledge of ourselves."* And what is that problem less than to arrive at the knowledge of God?

In the laws and principles regulating the sciences God has located the same purpose, namely, to declare His personal authorship of all things and man's responsibility to him. The interpreters of these laws and principles are to define and strengthen the bond of relationship between God and man; some by systematizing and arranging the spiritual and supernatural, others by doing the same thing with the material and natural. If in their work there appear sometimes seeming incongruities and harsh antagonisms; if they are often actuated by bitter animosities; if they are intolerant of each other's plans, and ridicule each other's systems, they miss practical benefits but can not subvert God's ultimate purpose.

Perhaps there is no more conclusive demonstration of the harmonious working of the sciences to a definite object than that declared in the present searching inductive processes applied to comparative philology, ethnology and religion. It is no less significant than surprising that the results of these investigations, no matter from what motives instituted, invariably point to Western Asia as the centre of the human race—the precise scriptural location of man's original dwelling place. Whether the investigators intend it or not—

* Atlantic Monthly.

whether they be Whitneys or Moffats—they are contributing insuperable evidences to the genuineness and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures. So God uses the human mind to confirm His Word.

A similar unity of purpose will be found to reside in the specific physical sciences. Their phenomena witness to the All-creative Intelligence; and their investigators are building up so many proofs of God's existence, wisdom and power. It is a favorite argument of the Scientists in their advocacy of the immutability of law and indestructibility of matter to refer to the correlation and conservation of physical forces; but there is a correlation and conservation of mind as well as matter, because God controls human thought and distributes it among rational thinkers. In illustration of this idea I transfer to this paper, in substance, a passage from the "Higher Ministry of Nature:" There is an Omnific Will in the spiritual as well as material kingdom. You find continual correlations in the material kingdom. In heat a manifestation of force which may be changed into light and electricity. In life you find a manifestation of force which, as you think, may be transformed from heat, or from light, or from electricity into the organism you examine. Why not the same process, the same interchange in the kingdom of spirit? In this man's mind there is force of one kind; in that man's mind force of another, and in a third man's mind still another. What are these but mental correlations? What are they but effluxes from the same supreme force, all tending to educate the human spirit and fit it for the highest excellence?

In those labyrinthine gardens of England, the numerous pathways, so confusing and perplexing, all converge at one spot, and bring the visitor to the most beautiful and perfect specimens of botanical science. The men who are now delving among the rocks; gathering the lost or hidden threads of human speech; or dissecting and reconstructing the wonders of the human body; or tracing out the affinities of matter; or formulating the faculties of the human soul, are all working to one common centre, some it may be uncon-

sciously or unintentionally, but none the less surely. To change the illustration;—in the final object to be attained, there is no conflict between the two institutions whose Presidents edit this Review. The class in the philosophical or astronomical department surrounded by ingenious apparatus and intricate formulas, and intent on some experiment in chemistry or the solution of some celestial problem, may well pursue their investigations in the spirit of Newton's devout saying when he fitted his grand problem to the sky: "Oh God I think thy thoughts after thee!" And when, after awhile, some out of these classes will be prosecuting a different, but not holier line of study in the theological class, that oft quoted sentence of the Psalmist may serve as a constant inspirer to their work: "How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!" The attainment unto God's thoughts must be the result of both scientific and theological study.

In view of this harmony between religion and science would it not seem a sad evidence of recreancy to taste, duty, principle and usefulness, to abandon, as soon as one has entered upon the active duties of the ministry, the very studies which lie, so to speak, at the foundation of religious and intellectual culture? And does it not seem unreasonable, not to say ignoble, to seek to avoid responsibility on the pretence that if science is so closely allied to religion the scientist should become the preacher of righteousness? Since the weapon is forged, ready for use, is it not a mark of the highest wisdom to grasp it in defence of the vital truths promulgated from the sacred desk?

When Sherlock was defending Christianity by showing its agreement with the religion of nature, Warburton said:

"It is sport to see

The engineer hoist with his own petard." *

Nature is now apotheosized by anti-supernatural writers—elevated to the topmost rank of thought—exalted higher than the heavens. If the clergy can turn this weapon against

* Contemporary Review.

the opponents of Christianity, they will, like the storming party of a fortress, deal discomfiture to the foe with his own implements of warfare.

2. Out of this inducement naturally grows a second: The impossibility of keeping pace with some of the most attractive and stimulating thought of the age, without some knowledge of science.

Every era is remarkable for the special prominence of some distinctive reign of thought. Thus are formed the critical periods of history, and to pass through them ignorant of the predominant ideas is a mark of stupidity. The age of Philip the II. was a theological period; every body studied theology from the monarch on the throne to the soldier in the tent. When Kant, the prince of thinkers, held the intellectual sceptre over Europe, even the ale-house rang with metaphysical discussions. Ours are scientific times—the most distinctively so perhaps of all time. Not metaphysics nor even adverse biblical criticism form the main themes of discussion. Where there is one John Stuart Mill there are a hundred Darwins. Where there is one Strauss there are scores of Hæckels. Physical Science is the great subject of thought and speech, and to be ignorant of its primary laws and facts is a defect only second to ignorance of the principles of morality and religion. Our journals from the daily to the quarterly giving evidence of this scientific tendency; the attempts of scientists at popularizing their ideas by lectures, tracts and school books being significant of the prevailing taste; all the prominent literary institutions of the land being engaged in taking up the subject in great earnestness—even the managers of public and preparatory schools feeling the need of keeping pace with pressing demands, would seem to indicate the need of a forward movement on the side of religious teachers of the world.

And yet, "what of it?" asks the easy-going pastor, or he who labors under the mistaken notion that these are secular matters unworthy of the gospel minister's attention; and, perhaps, the utmost display of his energies is a studied contempt for the whole of it, or a violent declamation against

infidels. Meanwhile, the young men of his congregation are helping Tyndall to apply the prayer guage, or following Huxley in his search for the Physical Basis of life, or admiring Spencer reconstructing the social fabric not on the idea of God and humanity, but the blind impulses of evolution.

Doubtless the firm and holy faith of the pastor, in the long run—so far as the eternal interests of both are concerned—is infinitely more valuable than the barren scientific knowledge of his speculative parishioners; but, if he has made a study of the adaptation of body to mind, eye to sight, spirit to matter, he will probably be able to demonstrate in a more satisfactory manner why he does not believe himself to be the final development of the moreen or spatter of mucilage on the sea weed, any more than that the ape owes his existence to the parasitical pests in their struggle for life on his back. He will be able to put argument against assertion; realities against hypotheses, and so expose many of the most plausible and fascinating absurdities of the day. Even though his conception of his own origin and the idea of the Supreme Being be much the result of primary belief, he need not treat inductive reasoning as a misapplication of time and talent, nor underrate scientific investigation in attaining to a better knowledge of himself and the evidences of the All-Creative Power.

Furthermore, not only will he thus keep pace with the advanced thought about him, and be ready to meet its errors, but he will also reap the practical benefits offered by the achievements of science, as auxiliaries in interpreting and enforcing Scripture. Christlieb pronounces physical discoveries the keys to Revelation, and he who has studied them sufficiently to be able to apply them in unfolding and illustrating argument on the grand scheme of human salvation, is master of the situation. Like William the Silent, and John of Barneveld, in their day, he takes in at a glance the interests at issue, and with one bold stroke directs all this vigorous thought against the enemies of the cross. What though he be no genious to originate thought, he shall yet turn thought into new channels to subserve new purposes. Was it not the

revival of letters in France, and the introduction of classical study from the East—the thorough examination of the heathen Plato and Aristotle—which formed such a potent element in the Reformation? The Almighty Conservator of intellectual force has not raised up the great scientists for nought. To wield their discoveries in defence of Christianity, is a mark of faithfulness to divine purposes.

Certainly it is admitted that the study of science, as such, aside from the study of theology, may seem ridiculously insignificant to some; and that the knowledge of spiritual truth is far paramount to the most extensive scientific information; but who shall say that acquaintance with the one will compensate for ignorance of the other? In times like these the clergyman must grant the right to Prof. Huxley to be as much astonished at him for ignoring the claims of science as he is at the learned professor for pronouncing theology “the politics of the moon.” And, on the other hand, there is no need of apprehension that the wise appropriation of the advanced scientific thought will eventuate in the intellectual starvation of theology; neither is there danger of violating St. Paul’s injunction: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit.” “If our faith in God rests upon truth, then any new step in advance in the scientific knowledge of nature must give us a new argument for its justification, must confirm it, strengthen it, and illustrate it; for if there is a God, in the religious sense of the word, then nature is of necessity His first and oldest revelation.”*

3. The assaults of scientists on the essential truths of Christianity, should be regarded by clergymen as an important incentive to the study of nature.

That there is any possibility of Christianity ever being overthrown, or even permanently prejudiced by all the combined efforts of its enemies, perhaps none believe, except those who are frightened at the inroads of infidelity, and those whose hopes of getting rid of responsibility depend upon such an event. The religion of Jesus Christ can not be elim-

*Ulrici: “God and Nature.”

inated from the world, either through the timidity of its friends or the rancor of its foes. But whilst there is no great reason for apprehending its displacement, there is danger of vast mischief to individual Christians, and disaster to the Church from the rising sentiment unfavorable to the gospel.

Perhaps the clergy are not altogether unpardonable for their want of apprehension of this danger. Their training being of necessity mainly theological, and their intellectual pursuits naturally falling in that line of thought, they are disposed to overlook the encroachments of unbelief, or to imagine the theories afloat will not materially affect their beliefs and their work. Their suppositions, however, are sadly at fault. A brief respite from the classics, a momentary shutting up of the ponderous volumes on ecclesiastical theorizing, and a look into real and practical life, will convince them that the attacks upon religion by modern science, as defined by its most radical and often most learned supporters, are not as harmless and groundless as they were led to imagine. To men who watch the signs of the times, it must be a matter of astonishment to see those whose duty it is to defend the faith, afraid or unmindful of the vastness of the searching inquiries of this pre-eminently investigating age into all fundamental beliefs. When the most sacred and necessary elements of religion are subjected to scientific tests and analyses; when prayer, faith, hope, charity, are made to pass through the crucible; when the literature intended for the promulgation of the results of these experiments has become something enormous; when the very school children are imbibing the advanced theories of the day, it is not possible for the clergy to be too wide awake. And as the authors of these theories are men whose names have become household words all through the intellectual world, whose discoveries are considered worthy of discussion in almost every paper of almost every language, and whose sedulous, devoted attachment to their work, and untiring efforts to put their experiments into the most lucid statements, they are enemies whose voice is by no means to be silenced with a sneer. But it is the spirit of very many of these investigators—for it is the spirit of hos-

tility to the word of God, and self-confidence in its own power, as is shown in the writings of the most gentle and mild-mannered as well of the most violent and abusive—that may well be dreaded. This is illustrated in perhaps the most moderate of the newest theories—Spencerism, that *sui generis* philosophy which repudiates every system of Cosmology—Atheism, Pantheism, Theism—referring every phenomenon to an Unknowable Force. Here is an example of the subtlety, self-consciousness and infallible positiveness of some modern theorizing.

The intention of the author of this philosophy, can be read between the lines of any of his books from "The first Principles" to the Sociology. It does not require the statement of one of his most enthusiastic admirers, that his grand aim is "the displacement of metaphysics and the doom of theology." The danger lies chiefly in his manner of putting things. His books make delightful reading. There is not a thinker of finer mental calibre in England; no one with a wider and more varied acquaintance with the facts of science, history and philosophy; no one with such evenness of temper in meeting unfriendly criticisms; no one who can give such a charm to his system. As is well known, he is the Nestor of evolution. Like Kant, he has his admiring adherents everywhere, who pronounce him the "all crushing philosopher." A writer in the *British Quarterly*, not in sympathy with his philosophy, says, there is no one man living who is capable of producing an adequate criticism of his works.

The Spencerian philosophy, because of the simplicity of its underlying principles, can be put in a nut-shell. "From the simplest conceptions of matter, motion and force, are deduced the general laws of cosmical change. These in turn yield the laws of life-development. From these, then, are to proceed the laws of mind, until there shall be evolved the laws of social life and morality." If the theory is not satisfactory, it is not for the want of the characteristics of a genius in its elaboration, attractiveness of style in its presentation, profundity of argumentation and richness of illustration. If it

is true, the Bible, as the infallible authority of the theologian, may as well be closed; for supernatural revelation is entirely ignored. It has been well said that Spencerism and Theology are in combat *a l'outrance*; there is no room for both; one or the other must succumb. And yet Mr. Spencer does not understand why he cannot be as good a Christian as the most orthodox of his opponents. Nor is he the only one who thinks so. His views are inculcated in the Sunday school class by religious teachers whose intelligence and purity of character can not be questioned. It will be wiser for the clergy to prepare to convince these of their error, than to discipline them for heresy.

Spencer, however, is perhaps not as much a physicist as he is a collater and systematizer of the results of the investigations of physicists. It is these latter from whom come the sharpest and most hostile attacks on Christianity. They proudly claim for themselves the sole proprietorship of real knowledge; assume the incontestible prerogative to determine all disputed scientific points in their favor; manifest their contempt at what they call the blunders and ignorance of theologians, and stigmatize all who call their logic or conjectures into question as narrow-minded bigots, old women of both sexes, and Bible worshipers.

When at the famous Tyndall dinner some one asked of the savans whether a good deal of what purported to be scientific theory was not mere metaphysical speculation, and poor speculation at that, he was rebuked by a certain Popular Science Journal for his impertinent interference, and the intimation made that when a scientific pope speaks all the world must keep silence before him. Well, some of these popes have spoken. One wishes us to believe that because the winds and waves in the Bay of Biscay, as unconscious agencies, select all the sand grains of certain sizes and heap them up in special areas; natural laws, also, as unconscious agencies, have cut the wings of the humming bird and constructed the brain of Humboldt. Another, ranking high as a palaeontologist, although failing to see evidences of design in the external universe, upon finding a bone among some tri-colored

flint in a cave, immediately pronounces man's evolution to date back at least one hundred thousand years. And if the clergy fail to understand why men, who make themselves merry over a certain facility in finding the bones and relics of the saints, should detect such conclusions in the bones and pottery of their own discovering, they are told: It is the *odium theologicum* that blinds them. Should there be any further hesitancy to accept these infallible utterances the learned English Professor tells the clergy then to leave Science alone; and the noted German physiologist finds all that is necessary to say to these moralists: "Lasset sie bellen bis sie ausgebellt haben." (Let them bark until they are done).*

Now, there is an easy method open to the clergy in dealing with such opponents—a method which saves much time and labor. They can be met in the same spirit; they can be ignored altogether; their theories can be held in profound contempt; they can be pronounced infidels; their heterodoxy can be attributed to immorality; they can be read out of the Church, and unlimited denunciations can be heaped on their work; or their views can be adopted without qualification. But, to the eternal disgrace of Christian apologists, this method has been followed too often already. Those who laugh at the assumptions of that papal infallibility which excommunicates his Catholic Majesty, the King of Italy, and claims the Protestant Emperor of Germany as a baptized subject of the Church, can ill afford to be either infallible judges or indifferent observers in the conflict waging between Science and Religion. The spot on Hamlet's hand will not out, either by menace or flattery. Every thinker of the time admires Bishop Butler untiringly brooding over the problems of his day, until the Analogy astonished the world, though it required thirty years to construct the argument. True, it was said of him, as it is said now in justification of neglecting scientific study, 'to prove so little was not worth such profound and elaborate reasoning'; but since these times of ours are a perfect counterpart of his it may be answered, as

* Hodge.

it was answered then: when the nation is full of free thinkers, and when there is a probability of danger to religion, indifference is unworthy of reasonable men. Is it much to the purpose to say, that the battle has been fought and refought always triumphantly in favor of Christianity? A knowledge of the victory at Waterloo stood Moltke in poor stead to force the capitulation of Sedan. It is not enough that on our library shelves are Paley and Butler. There is need that on our study tables should be Hodge and Christlieb; nor will a hasty reading of even these supply the power to meet the combatants on the other side. To do battle in the armor of Saul is a venturesome, uncertain, and thankless task.

4. The change in the manner and spirit of religious controversialists is of vast advantage to the clergyman in the study of science, though differing somewhat in nature from the inducements already stated. The bigoted dogmatism of former times, in combatting the encroachments of science, has given place to calmer and more charitable reasoning. The time was when scientific discussions, from a theological standpoint, were very often synonymous with mingled ridicule and irrationality, and the accusation was not surprising that the bias of a theologian unfitted him to do justice to his opponent. Neither was such a judgment altogether unfair, for every one remembers the strange inconsistencies of many apologetical writers. Taken as a body, from the most rigidly orthodox churchman to the most liberal latitudinarian, each found sufficient argument in the Bible for his denominational peculiarities and, upon occasions, felt himself justified for indulging in very energetic polemics in maintaining his positions; but, to check the advances of science, the majority combined to crush its defenders, as though they were in league with the evil one. Every expression bearing on the biblical cosmogony was to be taken in the most literal sense. Elsewhere, indeed, there was plenty of figurative language, in the poetry, prophecy, history, but in the Genesis and other portions touching on science, each word must be interpreted not after the spirit but after the letter. Hence the Bible, in human

hands, became a terrible contradiction to the claims of science, the over-zealous friends of religion affronting and disgusting the most conscientious scientists, and emboldening the less reverent to reckless assertion and defiance.

It is refreshing to turn from such illogical and uncharitable efforts at vindicating religious truth to the more recent criticisms on the present radical thought, and compare, for example, the language of Hodge and Winchell with former writings of a similar purpose and character. The change in manner and spirit is a significant rebuke to the assumptions of superiority, infallible dogmatizing and over-weening pride of the ultra, anti-supernatural writers.

The assertion, "for stubborn bigotry commend us to the clergy," may have had a show of truth in the past; but to-day it is an aspersion which religious teachers cannot tolerate. They are not like the famous Scotchman, open to conviction, but doubtful as to the existence of any one able to convince them. They would have no special aversion, for instance, to the claims of Darwinism, providing it were not what its zealous supporters and most powerful opponents make it—an atheistic denial of final causes, but a gradual development of some lower created life-form into a higher, under the constant supervision of the All-creating and All-superintending One. But if they are to accept it they want facts, not hypotheses: arguments, not ingenious speculations; realities, not imaginations; filling up gaps, not over-leaping them. And, as scientists believe in the omnipotent force of laws, they ask permission to set opposite this belief, their faith in the Omnipotent Intelligence, whose mind is infinitely above human mind—the Originator of all natural law, who has started life, no matter in what degree of perfection; and they ask a place for their conviction that the "survival of the fittest," is not due to the laws of natural selection or the "constructive energies" of force—unless by these are meant order, design, purpose—but to the all-predisposing will of the Creator Himself.

Men, whose province it is to unfold the development of the redemptive plan in God's economy of grace, are not ready to

stultify themselves by denying a plan of development in the economy of nature; neither will they lay themselves open to the objection: Why God should have perfected the one almost instantaneously, although no human being existed to be lost, when he allowed thousands of years for the perfecting of the other, though souls went into eternity by the million unsaved.

A brighter day, certainly, is dawning for the Church, when her champions acknowledge the value of scientific investigation; when they admit that some of the old positions are no longer tenable, and that many a concession to science has strengthened theology. Neither is there a want of consistency in this, for the abandonment of the old dogmatic spirit is not relinquishing spiritual truths, or admitting science as the agent of spiritual purification, or ignoring history, or currying favor with infidels, or submitting to opponents because their arguments are too formidable, but it is, in sincerity, treating other thinkers with respect and exemplifying the spirit of the gospel.

5. This entire subject can now be summarized in one more reason for revived interest among clergymen in studying the works of nature. It is the superiority of their position. It must be evident to candid reasoners, that with a knowledge of the natural sciences they will have a great advantage over mere scientific students, and a vastly superior influence in moulding the thought and culture of their pastorates. The work of the scientist is to systematize and explain natural facts merely to promote the social, intellectual and material interests of society. Ordinarily there it stops. On the other hand the work of the clergyman, in addition to this, is to educate the moral and spiritual elements of man. The one aims at the body and the mind, primarily, if not exclusively; the other, without in the least neglecting these, aims at the heart and the soul. The one looks at the temporal welfare, the other beyond that especially to the eternal salvation. Therefore the advice so often given by extremists on both sides, "to leave science to the scientists," may have a show of plausibility for large and pre-eminently intellectual centres, where

the facilities for the promulgation of scientific results are manifold, but to less favored communities it is utterly inapplicable. In these the clergyman must be more than a theologian.

Certainly this idea is not at all in disparagement of the work of the scientists. No class of thinkers stands deservedly higher in public estimation; none, perhaps, work harder than they. Viewing the almost incredible knowledge of some, we are ready to acquiesce in Dr. Hodge's opinion of Sir William Thomson—"men of ordinary culture feel as nothing in their presence." When they have remained faithful to their higher nature, their patient investigations, their laborious experiments to secure accuracy, their almost incredible accumulation of facts and observed phenomena, and their splendid discoveries, have vastly enlarged our knowledge of the wonderful works of God, and entitle the men of science to the gratitude of the world; and it is sheerest folly to denounce them all as atheistic. Nevertheless, the fact can not be disguised that those whose sympathies are entirely with Christianity—as, for example, Faraday, Lawson, Forbes, Mivart, Owen, and many others—from the necessity of the case, from their unobtrusiveness, from the nature of their position, will not preach from their grand texts, nor make their teaching a direct bearing on the soul. They usually restrict themselves within their respective spheres, hence very rarely give public utterance to their religious views. Moreover, many of them are actuated by nothing save utilitarian motives, and still others only by positive hostility to religion. Hence, it happens, of necessity, that the secret meaning of Nature—its "Higher Ministry"—in a great measure remains unappropriated and unapplied, until the clergyman, "points the soul seeking after communion with God to an enlightened communion with nature which will lift it heavenward as on eagles' wings. It belongs to him to arrange the discoveries of science into a series of altar steps stretching through space upwards towards the throne of the Invisible Almighty One 'who inhabiteth eternity, and whose name is holy.'"^{*}

^{*}Higher Ministry of Nature.

In our great educational and eleemosynary institutions, it is the specialist who wields the sceptre of power, but it is not the specialist pastor who commands the most influence for good. The landscape painter in studying the features of his subject, will not always "roam among the valleys and ravines. Now and then he takes a long breath and ascends high table lands and lofty peaks. Waiting patiently until the clouds have dispersed and the mists cleared away, he notes well the grand outline of the hills, the winding of the valleys, the far-stretching plains, the distant sea, and the far-off meeting place of earth and sky." The pastor will not be able to picture on the lives of his parishioners that moral painting outlined over eighteen centuries ago among the hills and dales of Palestine, unless sometimes he leaves the words of the "Great Moral Painter" and devotes faithful hours of study to His works. Generalization is the preacher's strong arm, and as scientific study is confessedly remarkable for generalizing principles, it will qualify him for the exalted place to which he has been called.

In the Christian cosmology, the sciences in order of chronology come first. Whilst the incandescent mass flung off by the Creator's will, was cooling and solidifying, and strata of rock began to be placed on strata, the laws of chemistry—God's agencies to lay up the precious metals—pointed already to the higher plane of botanical orders; and these again, absorbing the vast deposits of noxious gases from the heated atmosphere, prepared the way for those gigantic specimens of the animal kingdom, which, in their turn, subserved the Creator's purpose to fit up this globe as the dwelling place of man. The devout student tracing out here the evidences of the Almighty's thought for man, in lifting up his heart to glorify the Father, does not forget that these evidences of His wisdom and power were to be sanctified by the Spirit to illustrate the plan of redemption perfected by the Son.

Now, if it were possible for a finite mind to discover all God's thoughts in His revelations, the result would be a clear demonstration that the redemption of man was the grand idea everywhere. The unification of these thoughts, and

their concentration upon one theme, is the pastor's work in contradistinction to the work of him who only reads nature by the light of nature. He can thus be a prince among his fellows, for God Himself has put upon him the mark of royalty; his duty is in the courts of the Almighty, for he scatters the proclamations claiming obedience from and promising happiness to the subjects of His kingdom.

It is time that the many-sided character of the clergyman's office be no longer overlooked. If it is meant only to persuade men to be saved, much of the learning and culture of the day might possibly be dispensed with; but in building up the Christian character, the possibilities and responsibilities of the man must be considered. There are ranges of development in usefulness, beneficence, importance for the perfecting of which the believer need not wait until after his transferral into heaven. He can be somebody on earth. Rev. G. E. Henslow, at one time Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge, having become impressed with the importance of taking Holy Orders, was transferred to one of the rural parishes, and there, *not by preaching science*, but by attending to its claims as well as to the claims of theology—by teaching Botany, Mineralogy, Geology—he was enabled to elevate his parishioners from neglect, ignorance and stupidity, to self-respect, social worth and thoughtfulness. The entire community was transformed by employing, in connection with his specific spiritual teaching, the natural sciences as educating agencies.

The American clergyman will see in this illustration an unsuspected source of power for moulding and training the people of his pastorate, for quickening their perceptions and ennobling their ideas. In the prosecution of such a course, he need not preach science any more than he need be forever joining together dried up theological skeletons. Even his favorite treasure-house of supernatural revelation points him to texts traced on the shifting sand, spoken by the trembling grass blade and opening flower, intoned by the hum of teeming insects at evening twilight, and the songs of birds cleav-

ing the air at sun-rise, and engraved on the stars shining in the stillness of night. "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

From across the Atlantic comes this advice by an earnest and reverent thinker: "It should be alike the duty and pleasure of religious teachers to discover points of accord between the story of creation written in the Bible and the story written on the strata under their feet. We ask the theologian to cultivate a close and loving acquaintance with nature, and the man of science to stand with fitting reverence on the threshold of human hopes and beliefs." If the clergyman will unite in himself the theologian and the man of science we shall soon, as men on shipboard looking horizonward and beholding sea and sky blended in one, see our spiritual work blending with our natural work. These agitations, the waves of conflict now rolling and tossing the ship, will calm into quietude as when, out of the Galilean storm, the Master spoke for the toiling Church: "Peace; be still."

ARTICLE IV.

THE ORDER OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

By the Rev. G. U. WENNER, M. A., New York.

"How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." (Psalm 84: 1, 2.)

The Psalmist expresses in these words his delight in the public services of the sanctuary. In these services there was indeed much to impress every beholder with wonder and awe. But the devout Hebrew found in them that which satisfied his longings for the living God. For here were shadowed forth those mysteries of divine revelation which were afterwards more clearly revealed in Christ.

The liturgies of the Christian Church have their origin in those of the Old Testament. Any attempt, therefore, to un-

derstand the meaning and purpose of our modes of worship must be founded upon historical investigation. It would be very interesting to take a look at the public services of the early Christians, or to worship with some of the ancient Greek and Roman churches. In every age of the Church we should find certain peculiarities in the mode of worship that would enlist our attention. So Papal Rome, the Reformation, Pietism, and Rationalism, each has distinguishing traits. Indeed, we might also say that a Church History could be compiled from the liturgies of the successive periods.

But notwithstanding these differences and variations the Liturgy of the Church has in all ages been essentially the same. Sometimes its true character was ignored; its features were distorted; portions of it were lost; violent changes were made; but nevertheless the principles remained, which in due time would again be recognized and applied.

I propose in this article to present a sketch of a mode of worship that may legitimately be practiced in the churches of the Lutheran reformation.

The subject is one that has received much attention during the present century. In the age of rationalism the idea of a worshipping congregation was almost entirely lost. For how could people worship who had lost their conscious relation to Christ? The sermon was the only feature of importance, and even this was of the driest and most unfruitful description. The singing of a hymn, and a prayer, for the sake of form, preceded and followed the sermon. But even the hymns and the prayers soon came to partake of the nature of sermons.

In the revival of religious life, which occurred at first in smaller communities and afterwards in the church at large, the effort was immediately made to restore the old liturgies. Thus in the Moravian Church there was a manifold development of liturgical worship. But the most important attempt in this direction was the liturgy of the Prussian Union, adopted in 1822. In this book the old hymns and prayers of the Lutheran church were brought forth from oblivion. The book was introduced by royal authority at a time when infi-

delity controlled almost every pulpit in the land. Thus the prayers were evangelical, while the sermons were infidel. In the great revivals that followed soon after the introduction of this book, it is touching to see how the people sought after the old hymn and prayer books of a former generation, containing the doctrines of the Gospel and expressing the experiences of evangelical faith. Büchsel, at present Superintendent General in Berlin, in his "Recollections of a Country Clergyman," relates that the Jews used to go to distant localities and buy all the old hymn books, and, returning to the places where a revival had occurred, would readily dispose of their wares at a considerable profit. In order to commend their books, they would sometimes read with unction such portions as related to the atonement, or the sufferings of Christ."

This royal liturgy marks an era in the history of the German Church, and is therefore, with all its defects, worthy of attention. Since that time a large number of scholars* have aided in bringing to light and establishing the principles of the mode of worship belonging to the historical evangelical Church.

The American churches, in which the German language is used, have been influenced more by tradition than by the results of historical investigation. Indeed in many of the older congregations the mode of worship borders upon Puritan "simplicity." On the other hand the German churches of recent origin, such as those of the Missouri and Buffalo Synods, have complete liturgies. But they are usually mere reproductions of the oldest *agenda* of the Lutheran Church, and are thus mainly valuable as collections. There is indeed a richness and fulness of material, which renders the liturgies of the post-reformation period superior to those of any other age. But so far as the forms of public service are concerned, they are representatives of local views, and need not be considered here.

* Cf. KLIEFOTH, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*; SCHOEBERLEIN, *der evangelische Gottesdienst nach den Grundsätzen der Reformation*; ALT, *der Christliche Cultus*.

That body of the Lutheran Church which is known as the General Council, has at present in course of preparation an order of Public Service in German. But if we are to judge from the copy which the committee have published as the basis of their work, little has been learned and much forgotten in the department of liturgies.

The English congregations of the Lutheran Church inherited few liturgical treasures from their German ancestors, and some of these have been lost.

The most notable attempts in the English language to restore the services, are the Book of Worship of the General Synod, and the Church Book of the General Council. The latter is in many respects an excellent book, and has at least the merit of introducing the terminology of the liturgy. Its collection of hymns is admirable. But in its Order of Divine Service it seems to have been misled by Löhe, whose *agende* it closely follows.

Wilhelm Löhe, the eminent Lutheran pastor of Neuen-dettlesau, was indeed a master of the subject. He lived in the services of the sanctuary. He was a true son of the Church. He could truly say:

"Beyond my highest joy
I prize her heavenly ways,
Her sweet communion, solemn vows,
Her hymns of love and praise."

His contributions to the devotional and practical literature of the Church are among the most valuable.

But in his *Agende* he does not claim to have done more than to have made an attempt to indicate the general order of the service. We are therefore not obliged to accept his work as a final result.

The liturgical views of Löhe are inspiring. His knowledge of the subject was comprehensive. No one can study his *Agende* without catching the spirit of the author, and realizing the importance of the subject. But in his arrangement of the first part of the order of service, there is but little doubt that he had a wrong theory, and that he was unduly influenced by the *ordo Romanus*. In the Roman order of

service, the priest and his assistants mutually absolve each other before the former begins the regular service. This is called the *preparatio missae*, and is a part of the service with which the congregation has nothing to do. Then he begins the *Introitus* with the *Gloria Patri*, which is followed by the *Kyrie*. Now this order is perfectly consistent with the Roman doctrine, but is not consistent with Lutheran views. Those who have had the opportunity of seeing the Church Book of the General Council, may have been puzzled to understand the meaning of what seemed to be a double opening service. The effect upon the congregation must always be distracting. Confession of sin has been made, the grace of God has been declared, and with joyful hearts the congregation sings the *Gloria Patri*, after which the second part of the service, the proclamation of God's word, properly follows. But instead of this order another *Introit* is introduced, and after the *Gloria* the congregation returns to Confession of Sin in the *Kyrie*. The genealogy of this arrangement has been indicated in the preceding remarks. Several minor defects of the book might be noticed, but the limits of this article forbid.

The Book of Worship is not, properly speaking, an order of public worship. It is rather a collection of a few liturgical forms and sentences for the use of such congregations as desired a change from the former monotonous order of exercises.

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

Before presenting an order of worship, let us consider for a moment the meaning and nature of such a service. The Lord's day has come. The church bells call the congregation to the house of God. God does not indeed dwell in temples made with hands. And yet He has said: "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." The congregation sustains a filial relation to God. The day has come in which this relation is to be celebrated in a peculiar manner. A service is to be rendered to God. Not "as though He needed any thing, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things." But the

congregation, knowing its Lord, seeks to establish its communion with Him. Its members bring the "living sacrifice" of themselves. But they also need His grace. And He has revealed Himself through His word and sacraments. Through these the believer is assured of his acceptance with God.

The entire service is therefore a revelation. It is not simply prayer, or praise, or the preaching of the word. Each is only part of that service in which God reveals Himself to men in the work of His Son. The service is therefore a sublime unity.

That this view does not every where obtain is very evident. How frequently the opening services are disregarded! Many come in only to hear the sermon. How listlessly those who are present engage in the services! Nor indeed is it a matter of surprise. The congregation is least of all to blame. If the whole service is to be simply a sermon; if we are to have hortatory hymns, and hortatory prayers, as well as hortatory sermons, we need not be surprised if the service becomes tedious, because some of the deepest wants of the congregation are suffered to remain unsatisfied.

In such cases the church is no longer a sanctuary, but simply a meeting-house. The introit usually consists of the confused murmurings of a whispering and talkative congregation. The hymns and prayers enable the congregation to secure needed rest by alternately rising and sitting down. The sermon is an oration on some topic more or less religious, and the benediction is the signal to put away the books, and to secure hats, overcoats, and canes.

But when the true nature of public worship is kept in view, and the perfect unity and progressive development of the service is observed in our order of worship, no congregation will become weary. Men everywhere will say: "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord."

Perhaps the objection will be raised that such a service is suited only to the wants of a really converted community. I admit that in a heathen community preaching or catechi-

zation is the most prominent, and at times the only portion of the service that may be used. But in this country most of our people are at least baptized members of the Christian Church. And if there are only a few awakened and converted persons among them, these at least are entitled to such a service as I have described. To the rest the service itself will be a sermon.

THE MINISTER'S PLACE.

In the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches, the congregation has nothing to do but to look on. In the Greek Church, the service is a kind of religious drama. In the Roman view there is an actual sacrifice in the presence of the congregation, the priest being the mediator.

According to the Lutheran view, all the members of the Church compose "a royal priesthood." The ministry is an office through which the means of grace are administered. But in the parts of the service in which expression is to be given of the thoughts and feelings of the congregation, as in the Creed, or in confession of sin, or in praise, the congregation must actively participate. Here we may find the reason for a full responsive and liturgical service. Although it takes place in a less orderly manner, the necessity for this practice is illustrated in many of the services of the Methodist denomination.

If these principles are correct, what shall we say of congregations occupying a state of complete passivity throughout the entire service. The minister at one end of the church, and the choir at the other end, are expected to do their best to keep up the interest; and, if they fail to do so, the service is a failure. Is not the theory of the Greek Church vastly superior to the practice of many a Protestant congregation?

THE ORDER OF SERVICE.

The order of service which we shall present, is not by any means complete. But it will serve to illustrate the various parts, and may be considered a *minimum*, which may afterwards be enlarged as the wants of the congregation require.

We have also entirely omitted the communion service, without which no Lutheran service is complete. The present order is therefore adapted only to Sundays on which the communion is not held. I have been guided mainly in my remarks by the views of Schœberlein.*

INTROIT.

The introit announces to the congregation the general character of the day. On the chief festival days it should be a psalm sung by the choir. On ordinary Sundays it may be a general hymn of praise sung by the congregation.

During the singing of the last verse the minister advances to the altar, as the place of prayer.

When the hymn has been sung the congregation rises, and the minister greets the congregation:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The congregation responds by singing:

Amen.

The thoughts of the congregation are then directed to Him who is the object of their worship; and the minister says:

Our help is in the name of the Lord, (Ps. 124 : 8.)

and the congregation responds:

who made heaven and earth.

But the thought of God immediately reminds us of our own sinfulness and unworthiness. The minister, therefore, says:

I said, I will confess my transgression unto the Lord, (Ps. 32 : 5.)

The congregation responds:

And Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.

CONFITEOR.

The confession of sin, as it is found in the Book of Wor-

*Der evangelische Hauptgottesdienst. Heidelberg, 1874.

Ueber den liturgischen Ausban des Gemeindegottesdienstes. Gotha, 1859.

ship, may then be repeated, either by the minister alone, or by the minister and congregation. During the Confiteor, both minister and congregation should kneel. This form is taken from the liturgy of the Church of England, but it may be used without hesitation in our churches. Where the minister alone repeats the Confession, there is a special reason for the congregation, as a whole, to repeat the *Kyrie*, a short but comprehensive prayer for mercy. Some congregations prefer the Greek form :

Kyrie eleison—

Christe eleison—

Kyrie eleison—

because it has been for ages the language of confession for the universal Church. So too the "Hosannah" and "Hallelujah" are retained in their original forms. The Greek form is also more harmonious. But if the English translation is used, it should be as follows :

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

The form in the Church Book is in imitation of the *Ordo Romanus*, and that in the Book of Worship is entirely unauthorized.

The soul has now poured forth its confession, and its plea. It seeks for mercy, relying only on the merits of Christ. "Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there?" Surely if there is any place in the whole service where the gospel may be preached, it is here. The gracious promises of God should here be declared, and after the *Kyrie* the minister should pronounce the

ASSURANCE OF GRACE.

God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, &c. (Jno. 3 ; 16) ; or,

For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed ; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee (Is. 54 : 10) ; or,

The blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, shall purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Heb. 9 : 14); or,

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, hath had mercy upon us, and for the sake of His dear Son, forgiveth us all our sins. To them that believe on His name, He giveth power to become the sons of God.

The Book of Worship strangely enough omits this part of the service altogether, and the Church Book introduces it under the term Absolution. Properly speaking, however, it is not absolution, either in form or character. Its form is such that the most sensitive Protestant cannot detect in it papal leaven. And absolution in the Lutheran sense is pronounced at the service preparatory to the communion. We have therefore, with Schœberlein, chosen another term. The scriptural character of this part of the service no one will deny, and its omission from the Book of Worship leaves an unaccountable void.

Those who are "in Christ Jesus," and who "sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." The congregation receives with joy and thanksgiving the declaration of God's forgiving mercy; and, the congregation rising, the minister repeats the

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.

Glory be to God on high !

The congregation responds :

And on earth peace, good will towards men.

Or else the congregation may sing the entire *Gloria in Excelsis*, a doxology composed soon after the days of the apostles. It is a song worthy of being sung by saints and angels.

In the place of this *Gloria*, we may also substitute at times a hymn of praise, such as

O bless the Lord, my soul !

or the *Te Deum*.

This completes the first part of the service. The congregation is now prepared to receive the words of the Lord. And since we can rightly understand these words only when

Christ and His Spirit is present, the minister one more greets the congregation :

The Lord be with you.

The congregation returns the greeting :

And with Thy Spirit.

A short prayer is now offered. On account of its brief, comprehensive character, it is called the

COLLECT.

It closes with the words: "through Jesus Christ our Lord." The congregation responds by singing:

Amen

The custom of responding "Amen" seems to have fallen into disuse in our congregations. And yet it has the sanction of divine institution, having first been introduced more than thirty centuries ago in a liturgical service of the Jewish Church, (Exodus 27 : 26): "And all the people shall say, Amen."

The word indicates a confession on the part of the congregation, and a confirmation of the truth of what has been spoken.

That the apostolic church borrowed the word from the Jewish liturgy, is evident from 1 Cor. 14 : 16, "Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"

A German proverb calls this word "God's great seal." A hearty responsive "Amen," indicates that the congregation really understands the liturgy.

After the Collect the minister reads the

EPISTLE.

The Lord himself is drawing near. He gives his word at first through the mouth of the Apostle. At the close of the Epistle, the congregation sings the

HALLELUJAH.

Or in place of it may be sung a verse of a hymn of praise, such as :

"From all that dwell below the skies."

The minister now reads the

GOSPEL,

after which the congregation sings,

Praise to Thee, O Christ!

The congregation having received God's word is ready, with the whole Christian Church on earth, to confess its

CREED.

This, as well as the reading of the Gospel, should never be omitted from the service of a Lutheran congregation. After the Creed the congregation sings a

HYMN,

introductory to the sermon about to be preached. After announcing the hymn the minister may also make the necessary

ANNOUNCEMENTS

of a spiritual or churchly character. If announcements of a secular character must be made, they should be referred to the sexton, who may read them from some suitable place. But a better way would be to post them at the door so that all may read them.

During the singing of the hymn the minister ascends the pulpit, where he is to speak as an ambassador of God. Silent prayer for the minister will at the same time be offered by the congregation.

At the close of the hymn the congregation rises to receive from the minister the Apostolical salutation:

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

The congregation remains standing until the text has been read, and the prayer,

*Sanctify us by thy truth,
Thy word is truth*

has been offered. The people then resume their seats, and the minister preaches the

SERMON.

To illustrate the great importance of this part of the ser-

vice, it is only necessary to repeat the words of the Lord: "He that heareth you heareth me."

After the sermon the minister repeats an appropriate passage of Scripture, usually

The peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus unto everlasting life.

This closes the second part of the service. The minister leaves the pulpit and takes his place at the altar. The congregation now sings the

OFFERTORIUM.

It is the thank-offering which the people bring to God. In apostolical days the offerings were gathered at this time by the deacons. These consisted at first of bread and wine and oil, intended for the services of the sanctuary. In later times these offerings were changed to gifts of money. So now we have the custom of the collection. But we must not lose sight of the religious character of this service.

If the offertorium is sung by the choir, it should be some suitable Psalm, for example the ninety-second:

It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most high:

To show forth thy loving kindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night.

The number of suitable psalms is so great that there is no excuse whatever for permitting the choir to sing pieces of their own selection, frequently of a miscellaneous and sometimes of a pernicious character.

After the offertorium, the minister advances to the altar and offers

THE GENERAL PRAYER.

The old liturgies of our Church contain forms for this prayer. Or if the minister and people prefer, a free prayer may be offered. I have for years offered a free prayer in my own congregation, but last year, when Prof. Christlieb occupied my pulpit, he read the General Prayer. The contrast was very much in favor of the latter practice.

After the General Prayer follows

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

It comprehends all that we may still have in our hearts for which we desire to offer our supplications to God. It is spoken, of course, by the entire congregation.

After the prayer, a verse or two of the

CLOSING HYMN

is sung, and the minister pronounces the

BENEDICTION.

To this the congregation responds by singing

Amen. Amen. Amen.

A few moments are spent in silent prayer, and the services are closed.

ARTICLE V.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

A brief list will contain the more important works which have been published during the last quarter.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*A Common Sense View of the Mode of Baptism*, by Rev. Samuel Hutchings; *Natural History of the Bible*, by H. B. Tristram, illustrated; *Christian Dogmatics*, a Text-Book for Academical Instruction and Private Study, by J. J. Oosterzee, D. D., forming Vols. I. and II. of the Theological and Philosophical Library published by Scribner, Armstrong & Co.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Mining Industry of the United States*, by Prof. R. W. Raymond, U. S. Commissioner of Mining Statistics, a large octavo vol. full of interesting and valuable information, with maps and illustrations; *Health and Education*, Lectures and Essays by Canon Kingsley; *Physiology for Practical Use*, by Dr. James Hinton, a compilation from various authors; *Transactions of the Pathological Society of Philadelphia*, from 1871—1873, by James Tyson; *Tribune Popular Science*, by Agassiz, Proctor, Chandler, Hammond, Brown-Sequard, Bayard Taylor, and others, and containing "The Wheeler Explorations," and

“The Meeting of the Academy of Sciences; *Physiology*, Vol. V., Special Senses—Generation, by Austin Flint, Jr., M. D.; Volume second of Herbert Spencer's *Descriptive Sociology*; *Some Leading Principles of Political Economy Newly Expounded*, by J. F. Cairnes, M. A., Emeritus Professor of Political Economy in University College, London.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Rise and Fall of the Slave Power*, by Wilson, second vol.; second and third vols. of Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*; *Story of the Waldenses Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, by Edward E. Hall; *Knights and Sea Kings*, edited by S. F. Smith, D. D., giving an account of the Knights of Malta, and treating generally of Chivalry, its rise, history and decline; *History of Germany*, by James Sime, A. M., edited by E. A. Freeman; *Life of Franklin*, written by himself, now first edited from original manuscripts, and from his private correspondence and other writings, by Hon. John Biglow; *German University Life*, the Story of My Career as a Student and Professor, with Personal Reminiscences of Goethe, Schiller, Novalis, and others, by Heinrich Steffens; *History of India*, from the earliest time to the present day, by L. J. Trotter; *Anecdote Biographies* of Thackeray and Dickens, by R. H. Stoddard, Editor, in the “Bric-a-Brac” series; *Era of the Protestant Revolution*, by F. Seebohm; *The Crusades*, by G. W. Cox, M. A.; *Life of Christopher Columbus*, by Aaron Goodrich; *History of the German Emperors and their Contemporaries*, translated from the German and compiled from authentic sources, by Elizabeth Peake.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*The Indian Question*, by Francis A. Walker, late Commissioner of Indian Affairs; *Homes, and How to Make Them*, by E. C. Gardner.

GERMAN.

BIBLICAL.—*The Book of Job Translated and Explained*, by Dr. F. Hitzig, 370 pp. Like all the author's commentaries, this one is very critical. The author, who is Professor of Theology at Heidelberg, is one of the best Hebrew scholars of Germany. He thinks the book is a didactic poem, arranged like a drama, whose aim is religious rather than dogmatic.

The Holy Scriptures of the N. T. Examined Connectedly (zusammenhängend) Part V. By D. J. C. K. v. Hofmann, 561 pp. This is a commentary on Hebrews. In the Introduction the author gives an account of the last part of Paul's life, from sources outside of the N. T. From a letter of Clemens of Rome, the author shows that the apostle went to Spain after his imprisonment at Rome. This view is confirmed by the Muratori canon. The view that Barnabas was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author regards as a fiction. He asserts that before the time of Origen, the Epistle was universally regarded as the work of Paul. The author thinks it was written before the Epistles to Titus and Timothy. The Commentary itself is profound, but its style is very difficult.

Theology on the O. T. Vol. II. By Prof. Dr. G. F. Oehler. 351 pp.

The first volume gave an account of Mosaism; this one treats of Prophetism and the Wisdom of the O. T. The first part of this volume considers the development of the Theocracy, from the death of Joshua till the close of the O. T. revelation, in five sections, as follows: the period of the Judges; that of the undivided kingdom; the kingdom of the ten tribes; the kingdom of Judah; and the history of the Jewish people, from the Babylonian captivity till the close of prophecy. The second part discusses, in four sections, the theology of prophetism, as follows: the doctrine of Jehovah Sabaoth, and of the angels; the religio-ethical relation of man to God; prophecy; and the kingdom of God. The third part treats of the wisdom of the O. T., in five sections, as follows: the objective divine wisdom; the subjective human wisdom; the moral good; the riddle of human life, and the effort to solve it; and the abandonment of this effort in the book of Ecclesiastes. The author of this posthumous work had the true evangelical spirit. Of all the recent works on the O. T., this is one of the most valuable.

The Revelation of John Explained. By J. L. Fueller. 730 pp. Besides a commentary, the author gives a history of the interpretation of the Apocalypse, showing how the book was regarded in different ages and by the most eminent commentators. Whilst many modern critics have questioned the Johannine origin of the book, the author appeals to the internal evidences, as well as to the testimony of the fathers, to prove that the beloved disciple was its author. He thinks it was written in the year 95.

The Revelation of John Part I. By Dr. Th. Kliefoth. 272 pp. He too regards the apostle John as the author. In this first part the author, besides a lengthy introduction, gives an explanation of the first three chapters.

The Significance of the Semitic Philology for O. T. Exegesis. This an address delivered by Prof. Dr. W. Volk at the Anniversary of the Dorpat University. The author calls special attention to the recent efforts to decipher the cuneiform inscriptions. The results of these efforts confirm many of the accounts given in the O. T. in a remarkable manner, especially that of the deluge.

HISTORICAL.—*The History of the Birth of our Lord, and of His first steps in life, viewed with reference to the latest criticism.* By F. L. Steinmeyer. 235 pp. The aim of the author is apologetic. The first section treats of the birth of Jesus; the second of his childhood; the third of his youth.

Compend of the History of the Time of the N. T. By Emil Schuerer. 698 pp. Since the posthumous book of Dr. Schneckenburger on this subject (published in 1862), a number of works giving an account of the times of Christ, and of the apostles, have appeared. Prof. Hausroth, of Heidelberg, published in 1868 the first part of his work on this subject, giving the history of the time of Christ in 450 pages. Ungewitter published in

1865 a volume of 173 pages on the history of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity till their final destruction as a nation, with constant reference to the sacred Scriptures. Ewald, in his great work on the history of the children of Israel, has given an account of the same time. And many works not on this subject, have nevertheless thrown much light on it. The importance of this subject, in the study of the N. T., cannot be over-estimated. The interest in the subject in Germany, is evident from the number of books that have appeared on it in so short a time. Schuerer, instead of giving an account of the nations intimately connected with the history of the Jews, as is done by some others, confines his work exclusively to the Jewish people. His aim is to give a clear idea of the soil whence Christianity sprang. He begins his history with the Maccabees. As the author gives an account of the inner life of the Jewish people, as well as of external events, his work is very valuable to the student of the N. T.

The Irish-Scotch Missionary Church in the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries and its extension and significance on the Continent. By Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard. 555 pp. The author aims to show that in the beginning the Christian Church of Germany was not dependent on Rome, but that Rome was an intruder. He shows that originally the Irish, Scotch, and German Church was not only independent of Rome, but that it was free from many of its errors. When this Church was made subject to the papacy, then also Romish errors were introduced.

The Old Church. First Part. By Fr. Boehringer. 270 pp. Second edition, thoroughly revised. The author has done valuable service in writing history in the form of biography. This volume is confined to the first two centuries of our era, and treats of Ignatius and the apostolic fathers; Polycarp; Perpetua of Carthage, the persecutions and the Christian martyrs; Justin, the apologist, or the scientific defence of Christianity against Jews and Gentiles.

The Development of the Religious Idea in Judaism, Christianity and Islamism and the Religion of Society. By Dr. L. Philippson. Second improved edition. pp. 371. The aim of this work, which consists of a series of lectures, is to exalt Judaism, to which its author belongs.

A work of deep interest is Fr. Rippold's *Life of Prof. Dr. Richard Rothe*, of which the second volume, 677 pp., recently appeared. The work is based on Rothe's letters. It is pronounced worthy of its subject. This volume treats of Rothe during his life at Wittenberg, as Professor in the Seminary; his first activity at Heidelberg; his stay at Bonn, 1849—1854; seven years of retirement at Heidelberg; the time of harvest, 1861—1867.

Three Archbishops one thousand years ago. By Th. Foerster. 128 pp. This book gives an account of Claudius of Turin, Agobard of Lyons, and Hincmar of Rheims.

The Ev. Lutheran Mission in the East Indies. By C. R. Baierlein. missionary in India. 164 pp.

On the *History of the Hussite Movement* a small work has been published by Dr. Fr. von Bezold. 114 pp.

The following biographical works have appeared:

Eulogius and Alvar, a chapter of Spanish ecclesiastical history during the Moorish period. By Count W. W. Bandissin. 213 pp.

Ulrich Zwingli: Three Lectures. By Dr. G. Finsler. 98 pp.

Helius Eobanus Hessus. A Biographical Sketch of the period of the Reformation. 128 pp. By Dr. Schwertzell.

Gottfried Arnold. His Life and his significance to the Church and to Theology. By Dr. F. Dibelius. 306 pp.

Victor Aimé Huber. Part Second. By R. Elvers. 431 pp.

On Hamann, called by the Germans the Magician of the North, two works have recently appeared. One entitled *Hamann Studies* (Hamann-Studien). By Dr. C. H. Gildemeister. 409 pp. This is the sixth volume of this author on Hamann and his works. The other work is entitled, *John George Hamann's Writings and Letters*, in four parts. By M. Petri. The fourth part, containing 584 pages, has been published this year.

Prof. Dr. Plitt, of Erlangen, has published a work entitled, *The Apology of the Augustana historically explained*. 260 pp.

F. C. Poeter's second part of the History of Philosophy has recently appeared. It is a compend of 204 pp.

SYSTEMATIC DIVINITY.—*The Freedom of the Will*. By Prof. Dr. J. H. Scholten. Translated from the Dutch, by Dr. C. Manchot. 284 pp. The work is divided into seven sections, and argues against the freedom of the will.

The true Unity and Freedom of the Church. By U. R. Schmid. 200 pp. The author discusses living questions, such as Church and State, the Church and the Confessions. He professes to be a Rationalist, not of the vulgar kind, but a genuine Rationalist who loves new truth but also venerates the old but imperfect representations of the truth.

Old Truth in a new form. Vol. I. The New Creation. By R. Loeber. 385 pp. A work rich in spiritual thought on the new creation through Christ.

J. H. W. S.

NOTE.—The unexpected length of some of the Articles in this number has compelled us to defer the publication of others till the next number, as well as crowded out all book notices.

Eds.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.



Article.	Page.
<p>I. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. F. W. CONRAD, D. D., of Philadelphia.</p>	<p>477</p>
<p>II. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. H. E. JACOBS, A. M., Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	<p>557</p>
<p>III. SHOULD CLERGYMEN STUDY NATURAL SSIENCE?.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. C. KOLLER, A. M.</p>	<p>597</p>
<p>IV. THE ORDER OF PUBLIC WORSHIP,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By the Rev. G. U. WENNER, M. A., New York.</p>	<p>614</p>
<p>V. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,.....</p>	<p>627</p>
<p>AMERICAN.</p>	
<p>Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.</p>	
<p>GERMAN.</p>	
<p>Biblical—Historical—Systematic Divinity.</p>	

